DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 735 24 CG 005 453

AUTHOR	Sussman, Leila A.
TITLE	Elementary School Cultures of the Metropolis. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Tufts Univ., Medford, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-7-8147
PUB DATE	Sep 68
CONTRACT	OEC-1-7-078147-3592
NOTE	125p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.35
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement, Case Studies, Classroom Observation Techniques, *Elementary Schools, Elementary School Teachers, Individual Development, *Metropolitan Areas, *Observation, *Participation, Reports, *Suburbs

ABSTRACT

This is a preliminary report of two years participant observation in four elementary schools. The study began with the objective of trying to discern the characteristics differentiating the atmonspheres of elementary schools in the metropolis. Case studies are presented in order to arrive at hypotheses concerning what gives different schools their peculiar atmospheres, and what makes a difference for the academic achievement and personal development of the pupils. The first of the case studies on which the report is based was made in a suburb where school system was reputed to be among the best in the nation. During the second year, a school system in the central city was studied. The researchers' observations and detailed descriptions of the schools are presented. (Author/EK)

ED038735

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 7-8147
Contract No. OEC-1-7-078147-3592

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CULTURES OF THE METROPOLIS

Leila A. Sussman
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155

September 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

CG005453

CONTENTS

Page

Preface 2

Introduction 3

Chapter I. Jefferson, Adams, Longfellow and Lowell Schools 5

Chapter II. Innovation and Resistance in an Urban School District: A Case of Title III, ESEA 84

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PREFACE

All names and places in this report are fictional.

INTRODUCTION

This is a preliminary report of two years of participant-observation in four elementary schools of a northern metropolitan area. The study began with a broad objective: to try to discern the characteristics which differentiate the atmospheres of elementary schools in the metropolis. It is a paradox of U.S. education that although it is locally controlled, there is great uniformity from region to region. The differences are not so much regional, as social class differences. Slum schools are not like lower middle class schools of the central cities, which in turn are not like the schools of the affluent suburbs. The less class-segregated schools of small cities are yet another type. Quantitative indices of school characteristics, like size, per pupil expenditure, teacher-pupil ratios, number of specialist teachers, presence of libraries, cafeterias and gymnasia catch differences in an external way. The Coleman report found that indices of this kind differentiate the schools attended by minority group children from those attended by the white majority much less than one might have expected. Impressionistic reports from the slums and the suburbs suggest much stronger contrasts. Case studies are needed to arrive at hypotheses concerning what gives different schools their peculiar atmospheres, and what makes a difference for the academic achievement and personal development of the pupils.

The first of the case studies on which this report is based was made by the author in 1966-67 in a suburb whose school system is reputed to be among the best in the nation. It is the least intensive of the studies reported here since it was undertaken to test whether part-time observation could yield enough data to be of any value. It was easy to gain entree into this system. The Superintendent is committed to research. He offered me access to any school I wanted to see. It was a bit more difficult to disassociate myself from this official sponsorship and gain the confidence of the teachers sufficiently to be able to observe without introducing too much "observer-disturbance". However, after two weeks, I was able to dispense with introductions from the principal. The teachers discovered that I was not part of the system, and had no power in it. Teachers I met each day began inviting me to visit their classes. They seemed to enjoy having a disinterested observer to talk to. I made it a rule never to go into a classroom without an invitation from the teacher, although I sometimes solicited invitations. I was refused only once in the course of two years. I never took notes during my hours of observation, having discovered early that to do so produced an unacceptable amount of observer disturbance. Instead, each day immediately after "leaving the field," I dictated my observations for later transcription.

During the second year, an assistant and I had the unusual good luck to gain entree into the school system of the central city. I say unusual because this school system was under violent attack from many quarters. It had become so wary of outsiders, so defensive, that the colleges of education were having difficulty making their usual placements of student teachers in its classrooms. However, my university was engaged in collaboration with the Board of Education to plan a new school (see Chapter 2). My colleagues introduced me to school officials who agreed to allow me and my assistant to spend time in the schools as unpaid teacher aides, observing whatever we might in the process. We committed ourselves to be present for a certain number of specified hours each week to do the chores of a teacher aide. As matters turned out, neither of us was actually used as an aide. The assistant, who had elementary teaching experience,was used more like a student-teacher or even a substitute teacher. This had its advantages since it gave her a close view of the pupils in the teacher-pupil relationship. I had been introduced as a professor. Some few teachers used me as an aide, to do clerical work, to work individually with pupils who needed help, to run errands, etc. but most were too awed by my title to ask me to do these chores. Neither of us was treated like an aide either, in that we moved freely from classroom to classroom, on invitation from the teachers, as no aide or student-teacher could have done.

Our transcribed observations run to many hundreds of pages, and are only partly analyzed here. Each of us spent four mornings a week in an elementary school for at least half the weeks of the school year 1967-68. One observer was in "Jefferson School", one was in "Adams", and both were in "Longfellow". All names in the report are fictional for the usual reason that we must protect the anonymity of those who were kind enough to make our work possible.

The second year of research was partly financed by the U. S. Office of Education.

Our study is far from complete. There is much information yet to be gathered about the four schools discussed here, some of it systematic data which will be needed for further analysis and for testing of conclusions.

In addition, we hope to observe metropolitan schools of other kinds from those described here. While a slum school is included here, it is not a typical one. None of the "Title I" schools in this city in which non-grading is being gradually introduced is examined here. These schools look, at least superficially, as though this innovation is making them among the best in the city.

The research will continue in 1968-69 on whatever scale the author can manage with the generous support of her university.

CHAPTER 1. JEFFERSON, ADAMS, LONGFELLOW AND LOWELL SCHOOLS

Elementary schools instruct, socialize and classify their pupils. The dimensions needed to describe their atmospheres - or cultures - can be derived from these functions. Schools vary in the amount of emphasis they give to each of the three functions and the variation is best thought of as a continuum. A fourth dimension of elementary school atmospheres is qualitative: an attribute of their instruction and socialization styles which I have labelled "authoritative" and "autonomy-directed". When referring to instruction, "authoritative" means all those methods where the teacher dispenses information and the pupil absorbs it. The teacher is relatively active and the pupil relatively passive. The "autonomy-directed" instructional style refers to those methods such as that currently called the "discovery method", and much earlier, the "project method", which make learning an active process for the pupil.

With respect to socialization, the authoritative style could be labelled "authoritarian" although it often is not extreme enough to deserve that label. Authority is clearly in the hands of the teacher, and the pupils submit to it. There is considerable status distance between teacher and pupil, with the teacher having far more power and prestige in the classroom. The autonomy-directed socialization style, on the other hand, diminishes the status distance between teacher and pupil. Their relationship is more egalitarian. The pupil is subjected to fewer external controls and is expected to exercise internalized ones instead.

The last point is important. Some commentators seem to assume that an autonomy-directed style, one which minimizes external controls is simply eliminating controls. Learning as an activity and the school as a formal organization require that pupils behave in an orderly, goal-directed way. Schools which appear permissive,which seem to give pupils a great deal of freedom are able to depend on their students' capacity for self-control, self-direction, and when external direction is needed, on their sensitivity to subtle verbal cues.

In the diagram below the dimensions of elementary school culture are depicted as a property space and I have located each of the four schools studied in it. The property space is drawn to state a hypothesis: the amount of emphasis on instruction, socialization, and allocation can vary independently of each other, but authoritative and autonomy-directed styles cannot. A school cannot have an authoritative instructional style and an autonomy-directed socialization style or vice versa. None of the four schools studied really belonged at the low end

INSTRUCTION

SOCIALIZATION	HIGH CLASSIFICATION H	HIGH CLASSIFICATION M	HIGH CLASSIFICATION L	MEDIUM CLASSIFICATION H	MEDIUM CLASSIFICATION M	MEDIUM CLASSIFICATION L	TOWARD LOW CLASSIFICATION H	TOWARD LOW CLASSIFICATION M	TOWARD LOW CLASSIFICATION L
AUTHORITATIVE									
HIGH									Longfellow
AUTONOMY-DIRECTED	Lowell								
AUTHORITATIVE					Jefferson Adams				
MEDIUM									
AUTONOMY-DIRECTED									
AUTHORITATIVE									
LOW									
AUTONOMY-DIRECTED									

of the "instruction" continuum. However, schools which do belong there exist.* A school which is low in instruction but high on socialization may be a reform school or a school for emotionally disturbed children, for instance.

Lowell is a K through 8 school with some 800 pupils, located in an upper middle class suburb which has become in majority Jewish. Over half the pupils in the school are Jewish and so are many of the teachers, although most are Protestant. Almost none of the staff is Catholic, in sharp contrast with the central city. The school is not distinguished architecturally nor does it have lovely setting. However, its facilities are superb. It has a large playground, gymnasium and swimming pool. It has a library of 10,000 books and many records. It has a shop for woodwork, a science laboratory, and a home economics room. It is visited regularly by specialist art and music teachers, and it has a French teacher who is there full time. Its cafeteria serves hot lunches. The children are predominantly upper middle class and very predominantly white. There are a few Chinese children who live in the community attending and in all of the grades 1 through 6, one Negro girl who comes from the community. However a dozen or so Negro children are bussed in from the central city under a special program of "integration" which involves many suburbs but only a few hundred pupils.

---

* Sam Sieber and David Wilder recently published a typology which was a cross tabulation of emphasis on subject matter, dichotomized into "high" and "low" and relations between teacher and child dichotomized into "authoritarian" and "permissive". From this four-celled property space they derived four types of teaching methods. Where the emphasis on subject matter was high and the relations between teacher and child are authoritarian they called the method "content-oriented." Where the emphasis on subject matter was high and the relations were permissive they called it "discovery-oriented." Where the emphasis on subject matter was low and the style was authoritarian they called the teaching method "control-oriented". And where emphasis on the subject matter was low and the style was permissive they called the teaching method "sympathy-oriented". The authors developed this typology for the purpose of comparing which teaching methods were most approved by parents, teachers, principals, and pupils in various socioeconomic sectors of a metropolitan community. Cf. "Teaching Styles: Parental Preferences and Professional Role Differences," Sociology of Education, Fall, 1967, Vol. 40, No. 4, 302-315.

Jefferson and Adams serve a school district located right at the edge of the city''s business center. It includes the Chinatown, and Adams, which has fewer than 200 pupils and only 7 teachers has a pupil population which is 99 percent Chinese. It has grades K through 6. There are two kindergartens but only one class at each of the other grade levels. In 1967-68, for the first time in its history it had the services of a Chinese-speaking teacher to help the many new immigrants from Hong Kong to master English. Jefferson has between 400 and 500 pupils and grades K through 8. Its pupil population roughly 40 percent Chinese, 30 percent white and 30 percent Negro, with a small scattering of Puerto Rican youngsters. Most of the Negro students are in grades 7 and 8. They attend Jefferson under the city's open enrollment program which permits pupils from outside the district to attend a school if it has extra room and if they pay their own transportation costs. Few Negro children attend the primary grades, but the proportion is increasing. Most of these pupils come from a middle-income housing project close by. Jefferson and Adams pupils tend to come from middle class, largely lower middle class families which are neither affluent nor poor.

The neighborhood of Jefferson and Adams is changing rapidly due to urban renewal. Many of the residential units occupied by Chinese families are being torn down and the families are moving, some of them to the suburbs. Whether they will return when the middle-income housing projected for the area is built, no one knows. The future ethnic and social composition of the neighborhood is hard to predict since the urban renewal plans themselves are under political attack and seem to change from month to month. Jefferson is at the boundary of its district bordering on a neighborhood which is ethnically mixed, including white, Negro and Puerto Rican families. If Jefferson continues in use as a school building, it will probably serve grades 5 through 8 for both its present district and the bordering neighborhood. Adams is already scheduled to be rebuilt and to provide grades K through 5 for all of its present districts rather than part of it.

Longfellow School is located across the street from a low-income public housing project in a relatively isolated area of the city. Although the project was built fifteen years ago, it is not served by adequate mass transportation and only recently have a supermarket, bank and a few other services besides the churches and school moved into the neighborhood. The housing project is racially integrated but the proportion of Negro families has gradually increased until they are now small majority. The population of elementary school age is 70 percent Negro and 30 percent white and that is the racial composition of Longfellow School. Longfellow is a new building which opened in September, 1967. Prior to that time there was only a K through 3 school in the neighborhood and project children had to travel by bus to attend the higher grades.

Longfellow has grades 4 through 8 and about 2000 pupils. As a new building, it has many advantages over most schools in the central city in terms of physical facilities. It has a large playground and a large gymnasium. Unlike the majority of the city's schools, it has a lunchroom and kitchen. It serves hot lunches (which however are not free and not even very cheap for an ADC family with many children.)

A whole section of the school is given over to shops. There is a shop for "foods", for "clothing", for drafting and for electronics. The equipment seems excellent. There is a science laboratory. There is a library gradually filling up with books and with instructional materials on tape. The school has no auditorium but it shares the auditorium of the K-3 school next door which in turn shares its cafeteria. The building, painted in cheerful pastels is attractive inside although the architecture is standard elementary school rectangular. Longfellow is equipped with breakproof windows. But at the end of the year--in sharp contrast to the school next door, it had not suffered any attempts on its windows. Since a large number of Longfellow's pupils are graduates of the school next door, this difference in the treatment of the two buildings suggests a difference in feelings toward the schools. We know that the lower school is unpopular in the community, which believes its principal to be racially prejudiced. Longfellow, on the other hand, started off the year with promising community relations. There were some signs of deterioration toward the end of the school year; however community feeling toward the school was probably still tentative. A general distrust of the school system among Negro leaders in the city was working against it.

How much instruction? How much socialization?

In both Jefferson and Adams Schools there are teachers, mainly the older ones, who take a lot of time out from teaching each day. They leave the children alone in the classroom for long periods, having given them some repetitive task, like twenty-five long division problems to do, or having given them nothing at all to occupy them other than an admonition to "keep busy". In these two schools the teachers can do this with impunity. The predominantly Chinese pupils remain quietly in their places and find something to occupy themselves. They scarcely stir and they don't make much noise. If a teacher in Longfellow left a class unsupervised in this way for even a few moments pandemonium would break loose. Sometimes the teachers don't leave the classrooms, but use their time in it to relax or do clerical work while the children are left with nothing to do. In one instance, a teacher who usually took a recess for coffee and cookies while her class was outdoors under some other teacher's supervision, came back from her turn at yard duty and took her recess as usual. She invited me to join her. While we had our coffee and chatted at the front of the room, the children whiled away a half hour reading library books they had brought with them to school, drawing pictures, or, quietly, fooling around. On some mornings in this classroom I calculated that pupils were engaged on an instructional task with the teacher or on a task she had given them less than half the time. The teachers refer to the Adams School as "the rest cure." They call it that, they say, because there are absolutely no discipline problems there.

However, I do not suggest that all of the teachers at Jefferson and Adams are doing so little teaching. One young third grade teacher at Jefferson keeps her class of thirty-eight pupils moving along at a fast clip. She is in her twenties and can stay on her feet for the better part of the long day which teachers in these two schools have to face. She was resentful one day when a vice-principal asked her to leave her classroom to do some petty clerical errand. She said to me, the observer, "Why can't he wait until recess? I could do it then." Most of the older teachers would be resentful of having their recess encroached on. But Mrs. Johnson was angry at having her arithmetic lesson interrupted. She had sent some forms to the principal's office rather than the vice-principal's office where they belonged. The vice-principal came into the room and told her to go and get them at once and bring them to him. She had been right in the middle of teaching an important arithmetic concept, and the interruption, as she put it, caused her to "lose the class."

Mr. Plumley, the principal of Jefferson and Adams, apparently shares my view that there are teachers in the school who aren't teaching much, but he levels the accusation, not at the older teachers, who are the "guilty" parties but at the more vulnerable (untenured) younger teachers who are not. One day a group of younger primary grade teachers were angry with the principal. They had gone to the audio-visual center of the city school system and had selected some films to use with their geography and science lessons. This practice is encouraged by the Department of Education. The teachers must take the trip to the center, review the films available, and choose appropriate ones all on their own time. Yet the principal had accused these teachers of wanting to show the films to "get out of teaching" - at least so they quoted him to me. For a couple of days they weren't sure he would allow them to show the films. Finally he did allow it. I saw them. They fitted very well with the content of the books the children were using. I saw one of the teachers who had participated in selecting the films prepare her class carefully for the film beforehand and hold a discussion about it afterwards. On the other hand, one of the older teachers who had taken no part in the selection of the films marched her class to the auditorium, sat through the film, marched the class back to its room, and continued where she had left off, with no preparation prior to viewing the film and no discussion afterward.

The phase "the long days these teachers face" slipped into one of the sentences above. The teachers in Jefferson and Adams have a longer and harder day than those in either Longfellow or Lowell. Their day begins at 8:15 and the children go home at 2:30. Since there is no cafeteria in most of the schools in this city the children bring back lunches and eat them in their classrooms at their seats. The teacher is required to remain in her classroom and eat her lunch at her own desk while continuing to supervise the class. In good weather there is a morning recess out-of-doors, with only a few of the teachers on yard duty, which gives the others about twenty minutes to get together and have a cup of coffee. This holds true in autumn and spring.

In winter recess, too, is held in the classroom. It is "too cold" to go outdoors, or else it takes too much time for the children to bundle into and out of their winter clothing. I have heard both explanations. Other than the autumn and spring recess there are almost no moments during the teacher's ordinary day when she is officially free of her class. Since the building has no gymnasium even physical education is conducted in the classroom and the class teacher is supposed to remain. Some teachers get a respite when their boys go to shop and their girls to sewing. The routine is physically demanding and psychologically fatiguing. It permits little variety of professional tasks and little opportunity to talk with colleagues. The teacher is isolated in her classroom, face to face with her pupils almost all of the time. Depending on the teacher's attractiveness, the pupils find the situation more or less tiresome, too. When student teachers came into Jefferson, the classes which received them were reported by their teachers to be delighted with "a new face."

At Longellow, by contrast, the pupils' lunch hours are patrolled by teacher aides while the teachers eat together in a faculty lunch room. Teachers are often free when their classes are at recess. They are free when the class goes to the gymnasium or to a shop. There are several teachers' lounges in the school where the faculty can relax with each other over coffee and cigarettes; or teachers may spend some of their free periods preparing class work or doing some of their innumerable clerical chores. Every teacher at Lowell is free of her class for a minimum of a half hour every day and usually for longer. The opportunities for communication among the teachers are much greater than at Jefferson.

Lowell has still another situation, a very tight schedule which starts at 8:15 but ends at 1:00. This school has a lunchroom where the teachers supervise the children, but they don't exercise a very close supervision and if they wish they can sit at tables with each other rather than with pupils. From 1:00 to 2:30 they are required to stay in school, but they are free of the children and can prepare materials for the next day, do their clerical work, or hold faculty meetings.

The data suggest that more rather than less teaching would be done at Jefferson and Adams if the teachers' schedules were more humane. Aside from the anti-professional consequences of limiting communication among teachers, the daily schedule is beyond the physical strength of teachers who are middle-aged and older. They take time out from teaching to survive. *

---

* After this was written the teachers' union won a concession on the matter of schedule. Next year teacher-aides will supervise the children's lunch period at Jefferson and Admas and the teachers will be free to lunch with each other.

In Longfellow, instructional time is not lost because of an undesirable teaching schedule but because of discipline problems. For instance, a teaching team of two men in the fifth grade have a routine of getting their class ready to line up to go to the cafeteria about twenty minutes before it is time to go. It takes twenty minutes and a three or four times over repetition before they get the class to leave their seats and "form a line quietly" to their satisfaction -- that is, before the class does it without a tremendous racket and several outbreaks of fighting.

In the seventh and eighth grades at Longfellow, the children seem quite alienated from teachers and school, and provoke incidents apparently without regard to the teacher's treatment of them. For example, a seventh grade teacher was rearranging the seating of her class. When she came to the fourth boy who was asked to move to another seat, he ignored her request. She repeated it several times while he acted as though he didn't hear her. Then she went up to him and took hold of him --not roughly--whereupon he shouted "Don't you dare touch me!" He also muttered some remarks which she asked him to repeat aloud. He refused. She finally sent for a male assistant principal to handle the situation, which was building up to a contest between her and the student which was entertaining the whole class. Incidents like this do not occur at Jefferson and Adams, but they are frequent at Longfellow. When they become pervasive, as they do in some schools, instruction may be largely abandoned. This has not happened at Longfellow but it has happened at "ghetto" schools in many northern cities. A student of mine who was teaching in an elementary school in another city of this state told me that he was having to struggle against most of the pupils and all of his colleagues for the opportunity to teach. There was an unwritten agreement in the school between the staff and pupils which he formulated as, "You leave us alone and we won't bug you."

At the lower grade levels the pupils in Longfellow School are usually not overtly hostile, especially with a teacher who seems to respect and be kind to them. However, even a kind and respectful teacher maybe unskilled or may feel compelled by the demands of the curriculum guide to pitch her lessons over the heads of a good part of the class. What occurs then is withdrawal. One sees a teacher conducting a lesson with no more than one-third of the class involved. The rest of the children are doing their own thing. The girls incessantly comb their hair. Many children play with toys they have brought from home, dolls, key chains, soldiers, little cars and trains. Many of them eat tidbits or chew bubble gum. They edge their movable desks and chairs closer together and giggle with each other. The teacher works with the children who are with her. For those who are not, the school is a custodial institution. They got left behind and out in the earliest grades and the school curriculum gallops ahead, taking no notice that they have fallen off.

The teachers in Longfellow are aware that the citywide curriculum is inappropriate for their pupils. (The average ability test score in the school is 90.) Several of them commented to us about it. One said, "There is the city curriculum, but we will just have to ignore it. When your supervisor comes around, you teach a lesson out of the curriculum, and then when the supervisor leaves, you just ditch it. The curriculum isn't for these kids; we have to do something different."*

The instructional content communicated in the upper middle class suburban school, Lowell, is a world apart in quantity and quality from the work at equivalent grade levels in Jefferson, Adams, or Longfellow. Since Longfellow and Lowell represent very nearly the two extremes of the educational continuum in the United States, this is not surprising. On a September morning in 1967, a fifth grade class entered their room at Longfellow and found instructions on the blackboard to write a one-paragraph composition about "a book you have read and enjoyed. Try to sell the book to me (the teacher). Tell me what was interesting about it, why you liked it, what were some of the main characters, why I would like to read it." Some of the children tried their hands at this, but most did not. A good number of them had probably not read any book outside of school. Others lack the skill to write a one-paragraph composition. Even for those who did attempt the composition, it took the better part of the morning to get one paragraph composed and then copied from the rough draft. That morning the teacher also spent a good deal of time trying to communicate the idea of a key to a map. At one point he asked how far it was from New York to California and got the answers "five miles", "ten miles", "ninety miles", and "three thousand miles". He also spent some time on the meaning of the word "research".

---

* It would be unjust to the school bureaucracy in this city not to note that some of its members are aware of the problem as well, and are trying to do something about it. Using Title I funds, the Division of Elementary education has introduced a system of non-graded instruction in the language arts in grades K-3 of twenty schools. They hoped eventually to extend it to all subjects, all grade levels and all elementary schools. For the time being their resources are not enough for the task.

At the same time, the Department of Education is resistant to change initiated from outside itself. The outsiders insist that no change would ever have occurred but for their attacks and their pressure. They are right. Yet this does not alter the fact that the Department now feels its very existence so threatened that the power to change from within is inhibited by an excess of defensiveness. There is a will to change from within, at least on the part of some members of the bureaucracy. There is also a great resentment against luxuriously financed outsiders who run demonstration projects disposing of funds far beyond any the Division has ever had. It is easy to run superior schools under the privileged circumstances some of the projects have been granted. The projects are irrelevant to the problems of education since the circumstances cannot be replicated on a large scale. As I show in Chapter 2, the Department's strategy is to accept these projects and any benefits for some of the city's children which come along with them but at the same time to resist any transfer of jurisdiction over educational matters to other agencies, such as the several universities and private corporations which are now fighting for pieces of it. Change from outside is also obstructed by the poisonously exaggerated uncomplimentary stereotypes which the educators and the professionals who run demonstration projects hold of each other.

Here is what happened on a November morning in 1966 in the fifth grade at Lowell:

> After Mr. Pannes had taken attendance, they had the news of the day. There were two boys who were the news reporters; they had clipped things out of the paper which they read to the class, and there was some discussion. One of them read a story about unidentified flying objects. Mr. Pannes asked the class how many of them had ever seen an unidentified flying object or had known people who had seen one. One boy recalled seeing something like that with his mother and someone else in Maine. He said that it looked like a saucer and was flying and was pretty high and was going neither fast nor slowly. Mr. Pannes asked the children if they knew other people who had seen them. He asked the children how many of them believed that these were really things from other planets, and then he asked how many thought it was a lot of malarkey, and it was pretty plain that he thought it was a lot of malarkey....

Then he mentioned a boy he had in class the previous year who thought he had ESP, and he told about how the class had done an experiment with this boy to find out if he actually did have ESP. Moral: rigorous experiment showed he didn't. Then the French teacher came in and Mr. Pannes and I went down to the cafeteria for coffee. After the French class there was a brief session with SMSG math. The children had done some, for them, rather easy problems. It was just a question of noticing that dividing and multiplying with large numbers was really the same as doing it with small numbers; you just do a lot of multiplying by ten and add in the leftovers. He was very casual about it, he had a few children recite their answers and they all got them right. He said, "Okay, that's easy, we won't bother with that anymore, we'll go on to the next set." They went and did that by themselves with the book. I started looking at the vocabulary on the blackboard. It listed "aperture", "motley", "discernment", "precipice", "encrusted". They have just read Hawthorne's The Ambitious Stranger, and now they are reading Poe. Each child, as he finished the math, began reading Poe. Some of them complained that they couldn't understand it, and Pannes said, "Well, the vocabulary is difficult, look it up. But you should be able to get the general sense of the story even if you don't know all the words." He is reading it with them, helping them with it. He started to read it to them and they began by saying who is telling this story, that it is the voice of so and so, and what he is saying is that he wants to get revenge with impunity. They all knew what "impunity" meant. I find the children amazing with respect to their vocabulary, amazing with respect to their mathematical skill, but they don't spell too well. Mr. Pannes is teaching them a little bit of grammar... when they worked with each other on their math... the room looked rather chaotic. He allows them to move around the room. They sit on the floor in back. They sit anywhere they want to work. Some pupils go out of the room. They are still telephoning state legislature candidates to come in and debate the state election in their classroom. Tomorrow morning at 10:00 they are going to have a Democrat

> and a Republican. They have already had two candidates come in. They said this morning that they like two at a time because then they get an argument (more exciting). Some of the children, at his urging, have been working downtown in party headquarters and he keeps asking them whether they've met anyone; he wants them to meet the candidates and see what they're like. The question is: are politicians better, worse, or the same as other people? This is social studies for the moment, but Pannes told me "after the election, ancient Egypt."

To summarize my answer to the questions "How much instruction? How much socialization?" I have tried to indicate that Jefferson and Adams do relatively little of either because there is so much "time out" that the schools don't do a great deal of anything! Longfellow is a busy place, but it is busy much of the time with discipline (socialization) and it ends up communicating, I think, even less instructional content than Jefferson and Adams. Lowell has a fast-paced schedule. There is a great deal of teaching and learning going on nearly all the time and as I hope to show a little more clearly in the next section, the instruction is at the same time a form of socialization.

Authoritative and Autonomy-Directed Styles

Instruction

Lowell's school system like those of other affluent suburbs, seems thoroughly committed to an autonomy-directed style. By contrast, the city school system's official style is authoritative. There is some ritualistic talk to the contrary. When taking the principal's examination, it is best to profess belief in the discovery-method of teaching, I was told by an assistant principal who had just passed it. However strong evidence of the city's allegiance to the authoritative style comes from a three-day pre-service orientation conducted by the Department of Education for teachers going into schools which receive Title I funds.* Both observers attended this orientation in the fall of 1967. Some of the teachers were new and some experienced, but all were new to the schools receiving these federal monies. The teachers were paid for attending the sessions. Since this was a situation in which everyone took some notes, it was the only field setting we were in all year where we were able to take notes on the spot. We believe we have a fairly complete record of the orientation. **

Four aspects of it stood out for me. First, perhaps because I am a sociologist, I took it for granted that the orientation would focus on how and why the children from poverty neighborhoods in these "compensatory education" schools differed from other pupils the teachers had encountered. I was astonished that this topic was omitted altogether from the orientation. I realized later that while nothing was said explicitly about children from poverty neighborhoods, a great deal was said unintentionally in the form of warnings to the teachers to protect their own and school property.

The intention was to keep silent about these pupils in particular, while sticking to discussion of pupils in general. I infer, perhaps wrongly, that the reason for avoiding the topic is that the orienters have little to say about the pupils save to give them a bad conduct report. It is safer to say nothing at all. The teachers will "find out" soon enough. (And having had no orientation which might help them understand their difficult experience, most of them will misunderstand it.)

Second, the orientation program shared a characteristic of Jefferson and Adams schools: not much was done. We had long recesses, long lunch hours and early dismissals every day, and still the orienters had difficulty filling up the time.

---

* These are schools in low-income neighborhoods.

** We produced some observer-disturbance by doing it, though. Teachers far from where I sat in the auditorium were taking notes very perfunctorily. But in my immediate vicinity, I set off a wave of more active notetaking.

Third, whenever teaching was discussed (a good share of the time was given to how to keep all the necessary records; how to handle audio-visual aids; how to beg, borrow and steal materials wherewith to decorate your classroom) the advice was of the authoritative school.

Fourth, to an uncomfortable extent, the teachers were subjected to the very style they are expected to use with their pupils.

We were told about a great many things which would be available in the compensatory schools that are not available in regular schools, for example, five teachers for every four classes; "language transition" teachers; art and music specialists and science specialists; lower case-loads for the pupil adjustment counselors and the testing and measurements staff; and non-professional teacher aides. It was said that each child was "entitled" to five field trips a year. One young man asked whether a teacher and his class could select their own field trips. He was told "No, there are only so many busses. They are big. They have to accommodate much more than one class and so there are standard field trips."

A supervisor from the Department of Education talked about the classroom. She said that teachers should be neat and tidy housekeepers; that when they wrote on the blackboard, they should always draw lines and write on them using the approved script. The teacher's desk should always be in order and always be in a place where it is visible to all the pupils and all the pupils are visible to the teacher. At Longfellow, one frequently sees a different arrangement. For instance, in one grade six class, the teacher had the pupils' desks and chairs arranged in a square with his own desk at the back, so that they could come up to work with him individually. He said that when he was in front of the class, he liked to be standing, not sitting, and he also did not like the feeling of an eyeball to eyeball confrontation between him and the class all day long.

At Lowell School, it is infrequent for the teacher to have the desk front and center. The teacher's desk is usually at one side of the front of the room or at some place in the circle of the pupils' desks.

The position of the teacher's desk is symbolic. The front and center position puts the desk between the teacher and the whole class expresses the teacher's distance from the class and her superior status. In Jefferson and Adams, the teachers make use of this fact by coming out from behind the desk when they want to change the tone of the room from one of formality to one of informality; for instance, when they want to read a story "for enjoyment".

A professor of elementary education gave a sample lesson in the Jefferson School one day after which the classroom teacher who had watched the lesson said to her "That may be the new way but I could never do it." Asked what she meant she said, "You talked informally to the pupils before and after the lesson and you talked to them about non-academic things. That is wrong. You must always keep the desk between you and them."

On the last day of the orientation, there were lectures on classroom management and on the teaching of reading and arithmetic. Here are some excerpts from our notes on classroom management:

> Mr. Collins talked about discipline... He said that poor control of the classroom could come from three causes: lack of stimulation; that is, the teacher was not stimulating the class; inability to teach, and lack of knowledge of the children you have. This immediately perked me up because I thought that we were going to be given some knowledge of the children but we weren't. Then he said, "You must be prepared," meaning you must make out the lesson plan. Another thing he said is that a new teacher should keep her eyes open and observe the old teachers because the old teachers know how to do things. *

---

* Gertrude MacPherson in her doctoral dissertation on "The Role Set of the Elementary Teacher," Columbia University Department of Sociology, 1966, notes that in the school where she was teaching and observing the function of the old teachers was to socialize the young teachers as nearly as possible to do things in the way that they had always been done in the school and not to introduce innovations. They were very helpful in giving information about school routines and procedures when asked. On the other hand, when she as a new teacher did some special things with her class of which she was particularly proud, she found out through the grapevine that the older teachers disapproved of what she was doing and accused her of "showing off". An identical anecdote was told to me by a young teacher in Jefferson School about her first year in that school. She had come into the school enthusiastic, with lots of ideas and had done many things with her class of which she was proud. Some of them were rather simple. She said that the school tended to be very bare of exhibits and she had decorated her room in a way that she thought was lively and interesting but after she had been in the school for six months, she got word through the grapevine that the older teachers thought that she was "showing off". Here is the problem of initiating the potential rate-buster which appears in so many organizations. What new teachers are told by old teachers is to forget that idealistic stuff they learned in college and "face reality". Which means: Do as we do. Don't rock the boat.

About the pupils he said, "Now, as for the children I don't care. You can read a lot of things; it doesn't make any difference. They can be difficult but basically all children are alike. You have to use your common sense. I'll probably say that fifteen times." (He did say it fifteen times.)

Mr. Collins' next theme was "Don't give too much freedom to the children", especially at the beginning. The important thing is to get habits down... There are certain classroom routines which ought to be firmly established at the start of the semester so that everyone knows them, and they can be gone through without any fuss. "Give the children the opportunity to help in all of the classroom housekeeping: handing out papers, and things that they have to work with, and collecting things, and doing housekeeping chores in the room. If some children are problems, don't ignore them. The worst thing you can do is say 'Well, that child is a problem and I'm going to put him off in a corner and ignore him' because probably one of the reasons he is a problem is that he has been ignored and he is going to get attention in one way or another, and if you try to ignore him, he'll try to get attention in a troublesome way". He also emphasized that there should be no children or groups of children who are teacher's pets; that the teacher must be friendly, firm, but above all fair. She must not play favorites.

Children are extremely sensitive to this; they notice it immediately if the teacher played favorites, and that this could be very bad for the teacher.

Then came a piece of more concrete advice. He said, "The first few days could be very important. They could be hectic because in these areas, children move a great deal and there will be a great many transfers to be made out. There will be lots and lots of interruptions; there will be lots of dealing with records. It is extremely important never to give any records to a child. They belong to the city and they remain in the city forever; they are stored in the child's last school. If you have to interrupt what you've doing with the class, give the class some work to do while you do whatever it is you must do. Don't just say to them 'Keep busy while I do this,' because the room will fall apart. The first few days can make you or break you...

"You mustn't appear not to know things. [illegible] you have to ask a question of a child, call up an individual child and ask him quietly what the procedure is."*

---

* Emphasis mine

In seating the children, he suggested that the boys be seated on one side of the room and the girls on the other side, although one might have alternate rows of boys and girls. "It may be that the children have been assigned seats already. Ask an individual child whether that is the case. Ask him quietly because you don't want to appear not to know things so that the children might decide 'Aha, she doesn't know what's going on.'"

...Mr. Horgan interrupted to say "Don't pay milk money for any children. If a child forgets to bring in his milk money, remind him to bring it the next day and just tell him that if there are any milks left over, he can have some. But don't pay for it because if you do that and say 'You can pay me back tomorrow', you may not get paid back and you'll very quickly find yourself in a difficult spot, buying milk for lots of children and not getting paid back. Besides, you're not doing the children any favor; they have to learn to remember these things."

Mr. Collins then went into a short discourse about watching your pocketbook. "Don't leave your pocketbook around. Don't leave temptation in the way. Put your pocketbook into the desk and lock the desk. Purses may very easily be stolen.

"It is very important to get wide participation of the class. I used to insist that the children answer me with a complete sentence, but some of the children may not be able to give you a whole sentence and they may speak in a way that you're not accustomed to hearing. And if you have children who may only be able to say 'Yes' or 'No', then allow them to answer you in that way, but make sure that all of the children participate.

"Be friendly, but not overly friendly; don't use slangy expressions in your own speech; don't try to be one of the gang; don't join them. Use praise. Sprinkle a lot of praise around; smile, don't have a frozen expression.

"One of the routines that should be established early is how they file in and out of the room. Usually, there will be two doors and they can file in one door and out the other and I would have them file by rows. Unless you do something of this sort, things can develop into bedlam. You may think that this is regimented, but it's absolutely necessary. You must train the children to follow certain habits."

Then he talked about the portable furniture. He said how much he disliked it when it was first introduced seven or eight years ago. He was wondering how he was going to handle this, but he said "You can train the children in certain routines of handling the portable furniture. They can arrange it in certain ways by a certain procedure and this is another way of training them in routines." (He still doesn't like the portable furniture.)

He said, "The Basal Reader is not supposed to be kept in the desks even though they may only be paper-covered books. They must be collected and distributed all the time and they should be kept on the shelf some place.*

"Have the children put their materials in their desk: the math book on this side, the reading book on that side, and so on and every now and then, you should have them lift their desk tops to see that the things are put away in their desks neatly and tidily and if they aren't, have them tidy up. Children accumulate all sorts of things in their desks and it's amazing what they will accumulate in their desks and every now and then, you may have to have them clean them out.

"Assign them lockers by number. Don't let a child leave money in a clothing closet or locker; have him put it in an envelope; have him count it; put it in an envelope with his name and the amount on it and lock it in your desk and give it to him at the end of the day."

One teacher asked whether he thought they ought to let the children talk while they were having lunch or just make them keep quiet. He said that he thought it was best to make them keep quiet, at least it was

---

* Emphasis mine.

> better to make them keep quiet at the beginning and then give them things that they could do at their desks when they had finished eating. He said "Now that the Elementary School Act has provided books for a library in every room, you can tell the children that when they finish eating, they can go get a book and look at it." He thought that one ought to start by being very strict about being quiet. "Then as you get control of the class and the children get respect for your authority, you can start to relax." He said "For the little ones, it's a very long day, and it is important to do the most demanding work in the morning because they deteriorate in the afternoon." He suggested that they do their English and math in the morning.

The teacher who figures in this little discourse is the teacher of Willard Waller's classic The Sociology of Teaching, published in 1932. Those of my students who major in Education vehemently insist to me that this teacher is dead and gone. That is probably the case in many colleges of education, but teachers of this conviction and style are obviously still present in this school system and high up in its administrative hierarchy.

The conversation in the hallways between sessions was more revealing about life in Title I schools than anything said in the sessions themselves. After this particular session I got into a conversation with two men, one a junior high school teacher, and the other an elementary teacher.

> ...the first man said that he was worried about movable desks and chairs. In the school he was in last year the kids used them as lethal weapons. He recounted a time when he walked into the room and

took a chair from a child just as he was about to throw it at a much smaller child whom he could have seriously injured with it. He said the art teacher was standing there with her mouth open, unable to utter a sound. So he didn't like movable furniture. Then he leaned over and said to me, "You remember what Mr. King said the first day, about their having taken the money they had left over and sent these kids to camp for two weeks. Well, you should only know what happens in these camps. He said that some of these were scout camps and Camp Fire Girl camps. These scouts and Camp Fire Girls have a concept of the way you do things, of never touching anything that doesn't belong to you and clean living and so on. He said that when these (Title I) kids arrived it was just chaos. Everything fell completely apart. It was as though they had introduced complete chaos in the camp. Everything got stolen; everything get wrecked; the kids kept running away. They were up in the trees. It was just sheer madness. "I was upset because my own little girl was in camp and she wrote to me that she didn't like these Negro kids because she had experienced this at the end of the season. The camp fell apart." He went on to talk about the school he had been in last year, He said that the school had been chaotic, that there were fights all the time; that the girls instigated

> the fights frequently, although they didn't do the fighting. That is, they would somehow start two boys fighting with each other (over them?) and then walk away, very pleased with themselves. He had refused to go back to that school but he didn't imply that he was going to escape to a "better neighborhood". What he said was, "If this keeps up, I'm going to move down to the elementary grades. When we get them (in Junior High School), they're already molded, and some of them are pretty mouldy, and that's where you do the molding (in elementary school)". In other words, he's getting disgusted, but his response is to feel that he wants to get in on the beginning phase of things when the molding is being done.

In the afternoon of the last day we had some sessions on the teaching of reading and mathematics. These sessions were puzzling to me because they were quite specific and at the same time they were necessarily superficial. That is, we were told exactly how the teaching of reading should be done. One would imagine that all of the people attending such a session would have had courses in the methods of teaching reading in their schools of education. Perhaps it was feared they had learned some other method than the "right" one according to the gospel in this system (phonics) and therefore it was necessary to let outsiders know how things stood.

In the discussion on the teaching of mathematics we were told that the purpose of the curriculum is discovery, the inductive method of teaching mathematics, that is, letting children come to understand principles of arithmetic by discovering them themselves. However, the time was getting short, and this teacher had to go over methods of teaching arithmetic inductively in a still more superficial fashion than the reading teacher had done. I was particularly struck by one thing that she said. She pointed out that when children did an arithmetic problem they should check it by a different method from the one that they had originally used to do it. And she said that one way of checking an addition problem was by the method of casting out nines. Someone asked her to demonstrate it, and she went to the blackboard and did so. I had never seen it before. There was no explanation attached to it. In fact, she turned to us and said, "It's just a gimmick, but it works." That is certainly not the discovery method. After I went home I figured out why it worked, which I should imagine would be the point of teaching such a way of checking an arithmetic problem.

The counterpoint between what I was hearing in the formal sessions and what I was hearing in recesses went on all three days. On the first day I encountered a good deal of scepticism about the so-called "team teaching." The teachers said that the old buildings made real team teaching impossible. This is perhaps an exaggeration, but some flexibility of space is important in team teaching. The team teaching area in Longfellow School is an area of three classrooms with removable walls between them so that it can be turned into two classrooms or one classroom as occasion requires. Another time, after we had been given a lecture on audio-visual equipment, someone remarked cynically about the dozens of overhead projectors that had been stolen from one of these schools in the last year.

The teachers who had already been in Title I schools talked a lot about violence. One of them told me about a stabbing that had occurred in the yard of his school the year before in which a boy was accidentally killed.

Some of the young teachers just out of college of education were terribly impatient with the orientation. One brand new kindergarten teacher was aching to get to her classroom so that she could fix it, get it ready in preparation for her children. She had all sorts of materials (which she had bought and collected herself) that she wanted to place in the room before the children got there. This young woman, a graduate of a top college, told me that the postgraduate training she had received as a kindergarten teacher was excellent. Her comment on the orientation was, "It's just terrible because the professors there (at the college of education) know what ought to be going on in the school and yet there doesn't seem to be any connection between them and the schools themselves. It looks as though, although they already know what should be done, it's just going to take years and years before these things get done." Playing my participant role, I tried to find out whether this young woman's excellent training had included any of the things that were, to me, so glaringly missing from the orientation. I complained to her that I wanted to hear something about the children and their particular backgrounds. I said, "I suppose you girls who have come out of the education schools recently get courses in that sort of thing these days." But she denied it. She had had a course in child development, but no social psychology or sociology. Nothing, I gathered, which dealt with subgroup differences in child-raising practices, in family structure, in attitudes toward work, sex and aggression. The school where she got her training is supposed to be one of the best in the city. I wonder just how far the colleges of education have gone in incorporating these social scientific materials, which have been so long available, into their courses of study.

The authoritative themes of this official orientation were straightforward: Establish firm control from the beginning. Classroom routines must be unvaryingly structured. The desk is front and center so no one escapes the teacher's eyes. Boys and girls are separated. Teachers must never appear to be unknowledgeable about anything! Teachers must be neat and tidy. They must be friendly, but not too friendly. They should be scrupulously fair. They ought not to lend the children milk money. They should watch out for their purses. They should lock up money, school records. The Basal Readers should be taken away from pupils any time they are not actually using them for a lesson. Watch out for movable furniture. Keep the children quiet. No talking during lunch time.

The teacher's typical "nightmare" according to Waller, loss of control of the classroom with consequent chaos is still the nightmare here.* However, what Waller described as being true of all schools in the thirties is now most true of inner city schools where lower middle class teachers confront lower class children. Though Jefferson and Adams are authoritative schools, the style is softened there because the children are models of lower middle class good behavior. In upper middle class Lowell the teaching style contradicts these dicta in dozens of ways. ("I can't stop them from studying a subject just because I don't know much about it. I study it with them." I can guess what Mr. Collins would say of this remark to me from a Lowell teacher. In one of his asides he mentioned that the suburban schools were chaotic because the teachers there didn't know how to keep discipline. So much for suburbia.)

To turn to the schools themselves, here are some examples the teaching style in Jefferson and Adams.

> The afternoon ended with an art lession. The children had little boxes of water colors and they got sheets of paper to paint on, that were about 12" x 15". Miss Callahan pasted stems and blossoms--red blossoms of some flowers, I can't remember the name, that she had brought from her own garden--onto the blackboard and the children were to paint these. The blossoms were scarlet and the stems were green. She

---

* The best expression of this nightmare, acted out in an authoritarian French school is the old film masterpiece, Zero for Conduct.

gave them very precise directions as to what to do. First, they were to make a very light outline of the shape of the stem on the paper, and she did it herself on her own piece of paper which was pasted on the board. Then, since the stem was yellowy green, they were to take some clear yellow and paint in the stem in a certain way. Then they were to put some green over that. Then after they were to begin painting the flowers, each in bright scarlet, and they were to notice that each blossom was on its own little stem; and they were to go up and look carefully at the shape of each blossom so that they could make all the blossoms the same way. They were to try to get the color of scarlet that the blossoms actually were. Then they were to put in the green leaves that were on the stems. Miss Callahan emphasized that the children should observe very precisely what it was they were painting and that they should try to make the painting resemble the spray of blossoms as closely as possible in color and shape. These children, mostly Chinese,who go to Chinese School after public school hours and learn to make Chinese characters with a brush, en-

> joyed this very much. They like being precise, and they love working with the brush.

There is relatively little composition writing at Jefferson and what there is is of a rather stilted kind.

> ...one thing they did in a way of recitation which was a little bit more something of their own was they read sentences from the "before school" paragraphs that they had been asked to write. Since Columbus Day is this week they had read something about Columbus and then they were asked to write "before school" compositions, one-paragraph compositions, three sentences or five sentences about Columbus. Miss Callahan asked the children "Who wants to get up and read some of his sentences?" The children"s sentences were very simple in structure, factual, and imitative of what they had read. These compositions today were all alike. Columbus was born in such and such a year; he died in such and such a year. Columbus discovered America in 1492. Columbus commanded three ships named the Nina, the Pinta, and the Santa Maria. Columbus asked Queen Isabella for money to equip his voyage, and so on.

At Lowell, the children write incessantly. The walls are covered with their compositions (and their expressionistic art). They often write on their own initiative. One day, for instance, I observed a boy in the third grade who was exercising his privilege of staying in school from 1:00 to 1:30 if he so desired in order to write a composition about a tooth that had fallen out that very day and which he had in an envelope. He was very excited about this event and decided to write the composition himself. It was not the teacher's suggestion. However, when he had finished it he brought it to her and she gave him a little help with spelling and punctuation. He used the noun "probe" which was not yet in the official class vocabulary. The teacher had him look it up in a dictionary, copy out a definition and then put it, together with a picture representing it on an oaktag card. Apparently it will be his job to explain that word to the class since it occurred in the course of his work.

Here is part of a morning in a sixth grade at Adams School:

> I spent the whole period working with the children on these arithmetic problems. Mr. Marcellino had told them the processes they would have to use on the problems. For example, he would say "Number four you have to divide" or "Number five you have to multiply". This would help them figure things out. I was supposed to actually have them go to the board one by one and try to solve the problem. I found that really the children didn't understand--some of them did, there are three or four really bright children--but I'd say that nine or ten were just waiting until someone said what to do and then they were doing it. They didn't try to think things out for themselves. These were problems involving distance and rate and time and using these principles to figure out the answers to the problems. I had spent quite a bit of time getting them to try and figure out what they had and what they were looking for. All they really seemed interested in

> was getting numbers down on the paper.
>
> ...Mr. Marcellino came in at 10:15, he had them take out their English homework, which had consisted of telling whether sentences were imperative, declarative, exclamatory, or interrogative, and giving the appropriate punctuation for them. This took up right up until 10:30, which was recess time.

There is one teacher at Adams who stands out for the regimentation of her class. It is a fourth grade. Here are some of the things she does:

> She has a system whereby every child has a number. She calls the children by their numbers, not their names. All the books are numbered. Just about everything is numbered in some way. All the homework assignments are numbered. Each child every day has a paper. He puts his name and number on it, and then puts down every assignment. There's a chart over on the board with the boys and girls on it and with all sorts of stars underneath it, and the girls seemed to be ahead at that particular time. So there's that type of competition going on. When they had finished grading the arithmetic papers she also has another series of cards which she has been keeping for years. She has a card for every day's assignment for every class she has taught where she says what the classwork was and what the homework was. On the back of the card she has the scores of

> that class for a homework assignment. So she read these out, and she found out how they had done: six children had A-stars, another seven had A's. And she read out the year 1963: six children had A-stars, three had A's, and right down through the list. The children like this; they especially like being compared to the class a year ahead of them. So, everything is done according to a schedule. She has a card for every subject, for every day, and has accumulated them over the years. She has a card for every child for every subject. Each child has a folder for every subject, has a chart for every subject which is kept in the folder, has a set of stars which go after his name.

Longfellow School has a mixture of teaching styles. Some of the teachers recruited from suburban areas are trying to use the "discovery method" and others recruited in the city are using the authoritative style. Here is an illustration of an eighth grade teacher in Longfellow trying to use the discovery method in teaching science to her class and apparently having, on this occasion, some success.

> The third period class was very happy over the idea that they were going to perform an experiment. First of all, Miss Grasso told them that she wanted them to follow the basic outline which she had dictated to them and she then decided to leave certain parts of it blank for the students to fill in later; such as the title of the experiment. But she told them what she was going to do, namely grow seeds in different kinds of environment in different

states. She also explained that the supplies were limited; that as soon as the lab was finished, they would be going down there, but for the present they would work in the classroom. She explained the four different ways they were going to set up the seeds on the slide. She showed them the different materials and explained what they were. She then asked for a volunteer to set up the control group and one volunteer to set up each of the replicates. I was surprised to notice that there were very few hands volunteering. As I remember it in my day, whenever, there was any kind of experiment to be done that was considered fun, most of the children did raise their hands. I've noticed this over at the Adams School, that whenever there is something to be done which involves something out of the ordinary, the children are almost beside themselves with anxiety to be called on. Their hands are raised and they're rising up out of their seats. This was not the case in the Longfellow School. One or two children raised their hands, and Miss Grasso did call on these, and also she picked another couple of the children who she thought might like to do it, she later told me, but who were afraid to. These children came up one by one to do a part of the experiment and while they were doing this, Miss Grasso was going on talking about what the children would expect to find from each of the conditions under which they were planting the seed or putting the seed on the slide.

In the meantime, I was up there helping the children. The children really didn't understand what they were supposed to be doing. It was the first time that any of them had done anything at all like this and they were very unsure of themselves. However, I helped them and I praised them and they were able to do it right. Most of them were able to take the covering off the seed without any assistance. The main trouble they had was putting the cover slide over it and attaching it so that the seed wouldn't slip out. I helped them and then they labeled them with a great deal of pride it seemed. They put them over in a special container in which they would remain until the beans had sprouted. The rest of the class was very well ordered while this was going on; they were all very curious as to what was going on. And on the whole, it seemed to be quite a good class; they seemed to get quite a bit out of it. This took the entire period and they had just about finished setting the experiment up and writing down the notes they needed to have in the beginning when the bell rang.

Here is an example from Longfellow of a teacher who like those at Jefferson and Adams, teaches the children to quote chapter and verse from the textbook and to express themselves preferably in cliches.

> This particular class one morning was discussing the Pilgrims' first winter in the New World and the teacher asked them "What kind of a winter was it?" He got a number of answers to the effect that it was very cold; that there were a lot of blizzards; that there was a good deal of snow and his response to each of these was "Well, yes, but not quite." Finally he got the response "It was a very severe winter." That was the correct answer. Similarly, when he asked why the Pilgrims had come to this country, one of the children said that they wanted to get rich; another one said that they wanted to have their own churches, and both of these answers were wrong. The correct answer finally elicited from someone was "They came in order to be able to worship God in their own fashion."

At Lowell, the discovery method is actually used. Here is a sample from the rapid advanced sixth grade class. However, it is not atypical.

> She was talking to me about what she was going to do the period after lunch and she said that she had started them to work on space. She said something about the curriculum and I asked who constructs the curriculum and she said, "Well, the curriculum

is there but I actually have a great deal of freedom to do what I want to do with it. It says that there should be something on space. Well, what's that? It's anything I want it to be." She told me the various things that they had done: they had been to the University Observatory; they had gotten a Ph. D. student in Astronomy to bring a telescope over to school; they had looked at some things through the telescope and had gone to the Observatory one evening and seen Jupiter and they had also looked at the moon. What they were doing today was this: she had chosen captains and the captains had chosen people to work with, and each group of three had gone off and done some library research on the atmosphere. Each group was now going to make a report to the class on what it had found out. She said that she has them working together in groups like this and she makes them do it fast. She gives them only a short amount of time. They've got to find some sources; they have to work together; they have to divide up the material; they make charts; maps, collect figures, and they only have a limited amount of time in which to work it up. Today they were giving their reports.

Well they really were remarkable; not that the reports were remarkable, they were just simply gotten from very good sources, although I was impressed that the children were able to understand material of the sort that they did. But the thing that was remarkable was the way they had put together wonderful charts and illustrations and the poise that every single one of these young speakers had in front of the class. There were no signs of nervousness; they were not afraid to make a mistake.

One girl performed a little experiment before the class in order to show why we are deceived each day about the true position of the sun. She was explaining how the atmosphere bends the sun's light and makes the sun appear to be in different place from where it really is; in order to demonstrate this, she set up a few books to represent the horizon and put a tiny candle behind them and showed how one couldn't see the candle but if one put a large jar filled with water, representing the atmosphere, between the books and the candle, and the jar rose over the height of the books, then the jar bent the candle light and made it hit the books representing the horizon. She gave complete details on how to do the experiment. And then she had the whole class come up for a close look and they were not satisfied, I might emphasize, until every single one of them had seen it for himself.

Later there were some questions about fact, having to do with the exact size of the traposphere and stratosphere and ionosphere and with the exact height to which various space vehicles have gone. One girl said after having been questioned on one of her facts, "Please don't take our facts for truth, our sources are somewhat dated." Mrs. Purcell went up to the blackboard and wrote "absolute truth" and sat down again. In the meantime, the children were saying that things were changing so rapidly that a source could become dated very quickly and they decided to accept the facts that came from the most recent source. Incidentally, every child was able to name his source and its date.

Socialization

The instructional and socialization styles of a school are always both authoritative or both autonomy-directed. Consistency is inevitable because, although instruction and socialization are separable analytically, concretely they usually are not. Any instructional method communicates attitudes along with information and skills.

Jefferson and Adams are authoritative. Lowell is autonomy-directed. Longfellow has not yet shaken down to a consistent style. Some of its teachers adhere to the authoritative and some to the arbitrary diverted school. There is a latent conflict between their factions.

Another kind of consistency to be considered is that between the socialization styles of the home and the school. Jefferson and Adams, staffed mainly by lower middle class Irish and Italian Catholics, and attended by a plurality of Chinese pupils, plus a substantial group of lower middle class whites have a good fit between home and school. The white children are mainly lower middle class Catholics like their teachers. The Chinese pupils, who come from a different cultural background, nevertheless fulfill the teachers' conceptions of the "ideal" pupil--they are docile and striving. And the authoritative style of the teachers fulfills the Chinese pupils' conception of the ideal teacher. The teachers in both these schools view the majority of their pupils favorably, as they repeatedly told the observers. And the parents of both schools view the teachers favorably. The parents believe their children are well taught and they think the school as a whole does an excellent job.* I suspect that, with the possible exception of the Negro community, this is true for the bulk of the parents in the central city. Although the educational and intellectual leaders of the greater metropolitan area have repeatedly faulted this school system's "failure" to do its job, most white parents in the city are content with the schools. * This does not imply that they ought to be content. But it helps to explain why the elementary schools have remained unchanged for forty years.

---

* These statements about the attitudes of the Jefferson and Adams parents toward the two schools are based on a personal interview survey of a probability sample of parents of K-6 pupils. The survey was done as part of another project.

Lowell also exemplifies a good fit between socialization styles of home and school. Again, there is ethnic homogeneity supporting this. Lowell is in a Jewish community and has many Jewish teachers. (They may be a majority, or the Protestants may be the majority. The fact that I am not sure suggests a fairly even split. At any rate there are almost no Catholics on the staff, whereas Catholics predominate in the city's schools and population.)

The upper middle class homes of Lowell have moved toward egalitarianism in parent-child relationships and toward permissiveness in upbringing. This is mirrored in the school although not always to the degree that the parents would like. Every teacher a psychoanalyst sometimes seems to be their motto. The children are exceedingly articulate. The school reinforces the families' emphasis on verbal skill. "Language, language, language, " I heard a third-grader mutter as she returned from her reading group to home room.

---

* A comparison of the elementary schools of the city with national norms on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, published in mid-July, 1968, showed the schools to score at the middle stanine or above except for the predominantly Negro schools which scored below the middle stanine. (Many people, of course, have reservations about the norms since they were standardized in 1958 on several hundred thousand pupils from rural areas and cities of not over 300, 000 population hardly an appropriate group to compare with children of a large central city in 1968. This is a difficult problem, however, since most test "norms" tend to be based on "samples" which, though large, were not selected by probability methods. Part of the controversy over the evaluation of the More Effective Schools in New York City has centered on the appropriateness of the test norms against which the MES pupils' achievement was compared. "Good" test norms, that is, norms derived recently from appropriate samples don't seem to exist. In their absence school systems persist in making comparisons with the norms which are available---but probably misleading.

Only Longfellow represents a case of "non-fit" between child-raising styles of home and school. Neither the authoritative style nor the autonomy-directed style seems suited to the children. It is difficult to generalize about the socialization styles of the homes. They varied greatly. A census of the housing project showed that six out of 10 families in the project (and a still higher proportion of those with children) were headed by women. Sixty-four percent of the households derived income only from sources other than earnings: the elderly families from federal retirement funds, and the young families mainly from ADC. About half of the household heads were born in the South, mainly rural and small town. Most of the children, however, were born in the northern city.

A small study of families in the project by an observer who lived for a time with them showed how much variation of family life there is within these gross social categories. One southern-born Negro couple with four children had a stable, warm family life with an adequate income to sustain it. In another case a beautiful young Negro woman on ADC with six children neglected and abused them, practiced casual prostitution and was herself product of the kind of childhood her children were suffering.

Very many of the children at Longfellow, by their own testimony (see below) are disciplined at home through "hollering" and corporal punishment. But this is not "authoritative" in a way that the traditional Chinese family is. Chinese families exercise unquestioned authority without stern punishments. The child obeys because it is demanded in return for potent rewards which the family has at its disposal.* The ADC mothers of Longfellow's children may barely be able to feed and clothe them. They often have little control over the children. According to a study in a similar housing project in Washington, D. C. by Hylan Lewis "Loss of parental control occurs... in many of these families when the child is five or six years old..."** The children enter school with little verbal skill, little control of their impulses and great hostility and anxiety. The teachers unprepared for them and the organization of the school as well as its curriculum make implicit assumptions about the pre-school life of "the child" which do not hold in their case. The result is failure, and a vicious cycle of blame. Parents in impoverished Negro communities all over the north blame the schools for failure to teach their children to read. The schools blame the families for failing to bring up their children "properly"--for sending them such unmanageable and seemingly uncapable pupils.* To some teachers these descendants of slavery, caste, illiteracy and poverty may be "unbelievable". That was the word a teacher in Jefferson used to describe a nursery-age group from this project she had had in Headstart. "They were so little and yet they were already so full of fears that they couldn't take a nap; they couldn't even lie down and relax though we had them running around all morning. When they lay down, their fists were clenched." For many more teachers these pupils are to be avoided at all costs. The city's school bureaucracy (like others) has been very slow to realize that the uniform city-wide "neighborhood" school really needs radical adaptation to these neighborhoods. "I don't care what you read, all children are alike," said the Supervisor at pre-school orientation. And later, "The children may not be able to answer you in sentences. They may only be able to answer 'yes' or 'no' ". Yet these very children are supposed to learn to read sentences before they speak them!

---

*The unquestioning obedience of Chinese children is now breaking down, however, as the extended kin group, the family name associations, and the other institutions of social control in Chinatown, USA, become ineffective. Third generation Chinese-Americans are undergoing their own version of the immigrant as acculturation-assimilation cycle. cf. Stuart H. Cattell, Health, Welfare and Social Organization in Chinatown, New York City, Community Service Society of New York, August 1962.

**Hylan Lewis, "Child Rearing Practices Among Low Income Families in the District of Columbia" paper presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare, May 16, 1961 Minneapolis, Minnesota (mimeographed) p. 4 "The fact that the loss of parental control occurs early in many of these families (when the child is five or six years old)--whether due to parental abdication or the revolt of children should be juxtaposed to the fact that the adolescent period is the socially accepted or expected period for revolt." Lewis is here presenting the results of a participant-observation study of an intensive sort on a small number of families and he is not able to quantify these statements about early loss of control. He takes great care to point out that this like other patterns he describes does not characterize all of the low-income, mainly Negro families he studied. One of his main points is that there is great variability within the group - so that he rejects the concept of a "lower class culture."

The flavor of old-fashioned authoritative school versus new-fashioned autonomy-directed school is conveyed by city and suburban report cards. Both grade the children on a large number of subjects but both grade them as well on their progress in socialization. The city calls this "Citizenship Traits" and they include "Obedience, Loyalty, Honesty and Cooperation"--but first comes Obedience. The suburb calls it "Work Habits and Attitudes" and these include "completes work; is resourceful in use of time; is responsible as a leader or in a group (as a follower); self-control; listens attentively; participates actively as a leader; participates actively as an individual."

"Attitude" is a key word at Lowell. The principal's most frequent comment to children sent to her office was "Is that the attitude we want you to have?"

Two typical examples of how she handled discipline situations are these. One boy, who agreed that he had been "mean" to a girl was given the job of doing something especially nice for her every day over a period of time and coming to report to the principal what it was. The day I saw him, he said, rather helplessly, that he hadn't been able to think of anything especially nice to do that day but at least he hadn't done anything bad to her. The principal said that was not good enough and he would have to think of something nice to do for her after Columbus Day. He had Columbus Day to think it over.

---

*As Hylan Lewis' and Camille Jeffers' research suggests, many of the mothers of these children would do a better job of bringing them up if they were not involved in a daily struggle to make their inadequate welfare funds cover rent, food and clothing.

Another child had had a fracas with the teacher and the principal's admonition was "I want you to straighten this out between you and Mrs. Gruber before you go home today." In other words, the child was to negotiate some satisfactory agreement with the teacher. The disagreement could not be allowed to stand and the responsibility for making a concession was clearly on the child; but just what she should do or say was not indicated. This kind of negotiation is like what Strodtbeck has aptly called "The hidden curriculum in the middle class home". Strodtbeck makes the point that constant negotiation among near-equals in the family enhances verbal skill and interpersonal sensitivity.

Another indicator, like report cards, of the different behavioral expectations of suburban and city schools is filing. In the morning at Lowell, the children arrive in one's, two's and three's, enter the building and go to their classrooms where their teachers are waiting for them. In the city, children line up by class in straight and orderly lines in the school yard and file into the building led by their teachers. At Jefferson and Adams there isn't a great deal of fuss about filing. The children are orderly. There is a good bit of talk about filing, however, and classes win coveted gold stars for having the best line going into and out of the auditorium.

At Longfellow much is made of filing, of forming straight and quiet lines in the yard and of keeping them that way in the corridors. There is a similar emphasis on orderly filing through the corridors during the day. There are good reasons for the emphasis. The school is large, both physically and in terms of numbers of children and the children are extremely restless. Unless carefully watched when changing classrooms or going to lunch, shop and gymnasium, they make a terrible racket, get into fights and deliberately get lost. I have seen a fifth grade teacher at Lowell send his class to the gymnasium for their phys. ed. period without bothering to accompany them. At Longfellow, I have seen a class of about the same size and age return to the classroom from recess in the schoolyard with a teacher at the head of the line, a teacher at the end of the line, and me in the middle nevertheless lose some pupils in transit. They were too fast for us. Teachers worry about what may happen on these journeys(up the down staircase?) because they are legally responsible for the safety of children under their supervision. Some teachers' unions now provide their members with insurance against damage claims arising from accidents in school.

Several of the teachers at Jefferson follow a rule which was recommended in the pre-service orientation program. Each child must stand at the side of his desk each time he "recites." He is to stand tall and "speak up." This, of course, makes the recitation a formal matter and frequently it is made still more formal since the child receives a grade of right or wrong, good or bad, for recitation. The same thing is true when children are called on to go to the blackboard. But it is only some of the older teachers who follow these classroom procedures.

At Lowell School Miss Hall, Grade 1, makes materials of her own for the children to use. The first thing each child does in the morning is to pick up his own set of materials and begin working on them where he left off the day before. It is individualized instruction in the sense that the children are at various points in the progression of language and arithmetic tasks. Each time a child finishes a task, he raises his hand and the teacher goes through it with him, helping him and correcting where necessary and then decides whether he needs to do another set at the same level or go on to the next level. The teacher sends these papers home corrected, but not marked, everyday, so that the parents will have the satisfaction of seeing their children's accomplishments. The thing which is remarkable to me about this particular class is that the children work at their desks quietly, each by himself, on individual task, for about two hours. This is a long time for children so small to be able to work by themselves. This particular teacher is an especially skilled one; she's highly trained and has two Master's degrees. One of them is in Montessori method, a good deal of which she uses. At the end of two hours of individual work, the room begins to deteriorate a little bit and the children start to wander around and do other things. At which point, the teacher shifts the class into a group activity with a lively pace.

> When they first start to fool around and Miss Hall calls them to order, but she does this very gently. Her favorite expression is "I see fifteen experts who are still working quietly at their desks." Then she tells the children who are causing the disturbances that they are not giving the others freedom to get their work done, and usually by calling out a child's name in not too loud a voice, she succeeds in getting him to go back to his desk and return to work. If one looks at the children closely, one sees that some of them are much better able to concentrate and to keep at it than others, but it seems to me that they all do well considering how young they are.

There are socialization problems in Lowell School and one of them revolves around the question of authority. As we saw above, Mrs. Purcell teaches her rapid advanced sixth grade in a way which makes the status of the teacher and the pupils almost equal. She said to me, "I don't control them, they control me." This seems to be nearly true in her room.

Mr. Pannes treats his pupils in a very egalitarian way. He is casual with them. When he wants them to quiet down, he says "Shut up, kids. Quiet down." During a reading lesson one day, the children translated a difficult word to mean a phony, fake, or fraud. Then they teasingly said to him, "Like you" and he said, "Like me". So I was surprised one day when he told me that he was occasionally shocked at the liberties the children took with him. Last year he had discussed sex; male and female anatomy, and contraception with his class.

However, Mr. Pannes expressed shock and annoyance over a little fifth grade girl who had come up to him and said, "Do you know that Mrs. Johnson is pregnant?" He said, "Hmmmm" and she said, "Yes, she went all the way with LBJ." He said to me "Would you have said that to your teacher when you were in the fifth grade?" I said that when I was in the fifth grade, I wouldn't have understood that joke. "Well," he said, "that's the way they are, and their parents are afraid of them; intimidated by them." So while on one hand, he thinks the children ought to be taught about sex, and contraception, he doesn't think that they ought to tell jokes like this to their teacher. It's a mark of disrespect to him.

Mrs. Purcell also has had some problems with children's accusing her of exercising too much authority, even though she exercises less than any teacher I have seen.

> Mrs. Purcell told me that one girl in the class, an immensely bright girl, had nearly told her off one time. She had written her a long letter saying that she, the teacher, wanted everybody to conform and that this wasn't good because people should think for themselves and that she, the girl, was a non-conformist. Mrs. Purcell had written her back a letter in which she had said that probably the trick was to try to figure out how much you had to conform and with respect to what in order to be able not to conform with respect to the things you really didn't want to. She said this very smart little girl had been thinking about that for a while.

So the problem of authority does not disappear at Lowell, where the teachers are quite egalitarian with the children; however, the problem takes a completely different shape from the one it takes at

Longfellow. The question is how far can egalitarianism go? Isn't a certain amount of teacher authority necessary? The pattern and the problem are probably the same at home. The teachers at Lowell School constantly describe the parents of their pupils as "scared of their kids".

There were some early cues as to what things were like in the homes of the Longfellow children. At the very first faculty meeting of the year, a neighborhood social worker tried to explain with an illustration.

> ... someone raised the question of what did she mean by "these children were raised differently," and her answer was, "Well, I can give you a good example of that." She said last year the Neighborhood Center had organized a hootenany for the children, in the auditorium of the K-3 school next door. They had had all sorts of hootenany people there. They had about six adults and about two hundred children. She said the thing was complete chaos. The children ran wild all over the place. The six adults were absolutely unable to do anything with them. They were completely out of control and these adults were bewildered. "You know, you just can't control these children in the way that we're accustomed to doing--you pat them on the head and say, 'Now, Tommy, be nice.' These kids are so starved for attention, they are so emotionally starved, that the minute that anything like this happens. You have to understand that the children will do a great deal of this, that they will aggravate you and make terrible nuisances of themselves because they desperately want attention."

> Then she said that Mrs. Young, a prominent woman in the community, had finally come along and looked at this chaos and simply shouted at the top of her voice, "All right, you kids, shut up." The kids shut up. Afterwards Mrs. Young had bawled all of them out, "With all your education how is it that you can't control a few hundred children?" Mrs. Kane went on to say that what she meant was that the children were shouted at and cuffed a lot and slapped around a lot in their homes. "You know, I wasn't brought up that way. I wasn't accustomed to being hit and yelled at, but they are and they don't seem to mind it in the way that I would have minded it."

Another clue to condition at home came when some Teachers Corps Trainees had the children role playing.

> Jane asked them to act out some scenes with words. The first thing she asked the children to do was to act out being a teacher. One of them was to be the teacher and the other was to be a child who came to school late. The boy who was the teacher first took a whip and whipped the boy who came to school late, and then he grabbed him very roughly and practically threw him into a chair, and then he made him sit in the chair with his two hands on his head, and all the while he was shouting and screaming at him.

Well, that didn't get too far out of hand. When it was over, Jane asked the children whether they had ever had a teacher who treated them that way when they came in late, and about four of them raised their hands. At this point one of the big girls, the one who was more active and less sullen, had taken her ruler and was flourishing it with relish because Jane had called on her and said that she could be the teacher. It looked to me very much as if she was planning to hit whoever played the child with that ruler, but Jane handled that cleverly. She said that she would play the tardy child herself. So the girl was forced to handle the situation verbally, which was what Jane wanted her to do. They acted out their little scene. Jane walked in whistling but then she stopped and told the teacher that she was late because her mother sent her to the store for something and she was sorry, and then she started to whistle again and the girl, this very tall girl, taller than Jane, began to yell at her and told her that she would have to stay in school until seven o'clock that night because she was late. Jane protested somewhat mildly and that scene was over.

The next one was a girl who was having some trouble with her father because she was supposed

> to come home right after school and she came home after six o'clock. One of the boys played the father and the person who played the girl never did get a chance to say a single word because the boy who played the father began to shout at her the minute she arrived at the house. He got a whip and pantomined giving her a terrible whipping. He said, "I'm going to give you the beating of your life. Where have you been? Why are you late? I bet you were with your boyfriend." All the children giggled a great deal about this and he pantomined beating her about three different times and then he told her to wash her legs and wash her face and change her dress and he pushed her a few times. I think that was about all.

Role playing also brought out the low self-esteem of the children (they were a "special class").

> The next thing Jane asked the children to do was to act out two teachers after school talking to each other about their classes. Two boys did this. What they did was talk about the children who were actually in the class. They sat down; one of them put his feet up on the teacher's desk and Jane said, "We're not allowed to do that, so take your feet off the desk." Then they started to tell each other about the awful children they

> had in their classes. One of them said, "I have a very tall, skinny one: she's always jumping up and down and standing up." They all turned around and looked at this tall, thin girl who was, in fact, always doing that. They told each other how stupid the children in their class were and here again everyone began to giggle but the children were talking about themselves.

At the first big Parent-Teachers Meeting early in September the principal made a plea for understanding, saying, the teacher has thirty children and if one child misbehaves so as to disrupt the class, the teacher must act in the interest of the other twenty-nine. The parents readily agreed to this. The disagreement perhaps centered on what should be done about it. For instance, at this meeting, the parents brought to Mr. Tucker's attention that it was unwise to have young children carry lunch money to school everyday. He was puzzled and wanted to know why. They informed him that the older children "jump" the younger ones and take their money away from them on the way to school. The principal said, "That's terrible. You parents should be able to see to it that things like that don't happen." However, the parents insisted the danger was a serious one. They suggested two solutions: 1) the school should sell lunch tickets for a month at a time, so that the children would have to carry money less often and 2) the housing project would be patrolled by volunteer mothers every morning while the children were on their way to school to prevent these incidents. The principal accepted these suggestions somewhat reluctantly. In effect, the parents were saying to him, "This is what the kids are like around here; not necessarily mine but other people's." He was saying, "You ought to be able to prevent them from behaving so badly." The parents at the meeting appreciated Mr. Tucker's good will but they plainly felt he did not understand all the realities of life in the project.

Not infrequently, to a teacher's embarrassment, a parent called to the school to discuss a disciplinary problem would begin to hit her child in the corridor in front of the teacher and the other children. On one such occasion the teacher said to me afterwards, "That will keep her in line for a week. That's how you have to handle these children but I could never do it."*

Another teacher who wanted to keep a boy after school as a punishment, discovered that the boy wouldn't stay and as the teacher put it "Give me the time he owed me", not because the boy did not agree that the penalty was just, but because when he got home, he received a beating from his mother to reinforce the teacher's punishment. The teacher was not sure that he could dissuade the mother from doing this, so he gave up his own disciplinary measure.

One day, a mother who was visiting Longfellow for one of the regular Wednesday morning parents' coffee hours complained to me that the lower K through 3 school had let her little son (one of five children) misbehave for a whole year without telling her about it until June. She felt that it was wrong of them not to tell her. I asked her what she did when she found out about it. "I gave him the strap." She told me she had another punishment that this child hated even more, however. If he didn't do his homework as soon as he came home from school, she made him go to bed and would not allow him to do anything or get up for anything except to eat and go to the bathroom. He was permitted no activity whatever, and he hated that even more than a whipping. Then his mother went on to tell me that this particular child was a great scribbler of pictures. He drew pictures all over everything including the walls and his homework so that you couldn't tell where the pictures ended and the homework began. She didn't see how the teacher could tell. She was hard put to know what to do about it. It may sound like fiction but it is a fact that at this point the school art teacher walked up to her and said, "Are you Richard Virgas' mother?" "Yes." "Well, your so[illegible]s great artistic talent." The mother seemed surprised but pleased. [illegible] this case the message had a happy effect for the boy. Later Mrs. Virgas said to me, "I guess, I'll have to let him scribble. I'll have to get plenty of paper."

Richard Virgas deviates from the teachers' stereotype that the intelligent student is also a well-behaved student. He is a discipline problem in class. When his fourth grade teacher received his Metropolitan Achievement Test scores, he was astounded to find that Richard was well ahead of grade level in reading and other skills. In his case, the discipline problem arises from boredom. The school, far from presenting him with challenges beyond his capacity, is not challenging him nearly enough. Unfortunately, he has one of the least skilled teachers in the school. *

---

* Emphasis mine. Here was a suburban teacher in the process of changing her view of how "these children" must be handled. I hypothesized at the beginning of the year that the shift would go in this direction: that the permissive teachers would become disillusioned and leave, or adopt more authoritative methods. But I have no evidence that there has yet been a definitive drift toward one or another socialization style in this school At the end of the year the supervisor from the National Teachers' Corps (a Negro woman who is a crackerjack teacher) felt that there were too many "harsh" teachers in the school. But at the same time she told me that Mr. Tucker was opposed to this kind of discipline and she named at least as many teachers she thought were not harsh.

At another Wednesday morning coffee meeting the mothers who patrol the lunchroom told an assistant principal that the children were storing plastic straws in a place underneath the tables, rolling them together, sharpening them in pencil sharpeners, and using them as effective weapons. Their advice was: get paper straws. By this time the assistant principal had caught on to the fact that the mothers were usually right about things like that, and he agreed immediately. The interesting point, I think, is that he too patrols the lunchroom regularly, yet he was completely unaware that this had been going on. Still another thing that occasionally happens at Longfellow School is that a mother will come to school and tell a teacher rather helplessly that she is completely unable to control or discipline her child and will beg the teacher to do something about it.

---

* I observed this teacher at the beginning of the year. It was his first teaching assignment after graduation from state teachers' college. Although he seemed to be kind and well-intentioned, it was immediately obvious that he was incompetent. He lectured to the class, beginning with a point, diverging from it, diverging from the divergence and diverging from divergence from the divergence. He never came back along this branching pathway to tie anything up. Mingled with this were a lot of vague promises concerning delightful things that "we might do later on." I was not surprised to learn at the end of the year that this teacher had completely lost control of his class. He had had to be shored up with another teacher who in effect took over, although the original man remained in the classroom. He was dismissed, but to save his face with the children and parents, the fact was not made public. In any case, this is part of the code of behavior which teachers demand of principals. Any reprimands they receive must be private. In public, especially vis a vis parents, the principal must defend his teachers. If he does not, he sacrifices their loyalty and their cooperation with him.

In this case it was especially important for the principal to observe the code since there was a complaint against the teacher from parents. A pupil had smuggled a tape recorder into the classroom and taped a whole day's proceedings. He played the tape for his mother who became enraged at the chaos in the classroom. However, the principal was already quite aware of it at the time and was looking for a teacher replacement. He could not afford to allow his action to appear to be a yielding to parental demands. If he had done this his teachers would have condemned him. As things were, they did not, since they all knew that this particular colleague was a washout. However, the principal paid a price for sticking to the code. A militant black organization circulated a statement in the community that the principal had failed to dismiss the teacher because they were both Jewish.

I think there is a hint here of things to come in the decentralized school districts of New York City (if they are decentralized). There are generations of accumulated wisdom in the code. As McPherson makes beautifully clear in her dissertation, teachers must try to live

We noticed at Longfellow School that a sharp change takes place in the children between the sixth and seventh grades. This, of course, is the transition from what used to be considered elementary to what used to be considered junior high school. Longfellow is now a fourth to eighth grade school and is defined in this city as a "middle school". In this school the seventh and eighth grades are in the same building with the lower grades and on the same floor with the sixth grade. Nevertheless, there is a striking change in the behavior of the children between these grades. Whereas in the lower grades, a good many of the

---

(continued from previous page)
up to universalistic norms--treat all children alike - while parents must strive to live up to particularistic norms--my child's interests before everything. Conflict between teachers and parents is built into their respective roles. If the teacher is exposed to day to day parental judgment of her classroom behavior (as reported by pupils), backed up by the power to dismiss her, she will be totally unable to function. Things are unlikely to reach that pass, however, because a superintendent or principal who exposes his staff to the possibility of having to work under such tension will lose them. An authority which teachers don't accept won't exist. There is a need to break up the arterio-sclerotic urban school bureaucracies. But nothing will be gained by making the staff of the *school,* especially the teachers, even more powerless than they are now. Decentralization under the American pattern which already gives laymen far more control over professionals than they have in nearly any other country threatens to do just this. It seems inevitable that the slum schools will be turned into a battleground until the staffs learn how to do a better job with slum children and the parents find out that the teaching of reading is not some kind of miracle performed on the children in "good" schools.

Actually there were signs in Longfellow during its first year of how much promise there might be in giving school staffs some autonomy and allowing teachers more professional prerogatives. At faculty meetings teaching problems were discussed ("It's the first time in my thirty years experience in this system that we discussed professional problems at faculty meetings instead of being read some bureaucratic regulations we could have read for ourselves." This is a Longfellow teacher speaking.) There was a good deal of sentiment for "telling downtown what we need around here. And it's something different from their curriculum." Both observers noted that the conversation in teachers' lounges at Longfellow concerned professional matters whereas at Adams it was personal and nonschool trivia which made up the conversation during recess coffees. Even so, there are signs of professional vigor among the young teachers at Jefferson. In that school their best efforts are prevented from showing forth by a principal who exercises bureaucratic, not professional leadership. (See next chapter.)

children simply withdraw from what's going on in class, in seventh grade they are openly hostile, rebellious and provocative. They are not this way only with teachers who are harsh with them, but with all teachers. I am not certain why this happens at this particular grade level. This would be the ages 13, 14, and 15 and it is perhaps at this point that these children enter their version of an alienated youth culture. They seem to be almost totally alienated from school; almost totally convinced that school has nothing to offer them, that they can never experience any success there. If failure has been their lot up to the seventh grade, they may be quite correct.

Perhaps another reason for the transition at this point is that this is the age when these youngsters begin having adult heterosexual relationship. They are openly preoccupied with their sex interests in school. The girls like to provoke fights among the boys over themselves. Boys provoke each other by making obscene remarks about each other's girlfriends or sisters which call for an immediate aggressive response. It seems likely too that the fact that they have entered into an adult sex life makes the boys particularly resentful at being treated by female teachers as though they were children. Since their hopes of reaching adult status by achieving an adult occupational role are not very great or very near at hand, their sexual activity also has the significance for them of being the main way to assert their adult status.

Although it does not come out of these data, my best insight into this particular fact goes back to a plane trip from Puerto Rico to the continent with a twelve year old Puerto Rican boy in the seat next to me. We had a conversation about him. I discovered that he was barely able to read either English or Spanish. He was returning to Brooklyn where he was going to rejoin a large number of brothers and go back to school. He was very downhearted at this prospect and made clear to me that he did badly in school and didn't like it. I remember that the sun was sinking over the horizon. The boy did not understand this and asked me to explain why the sun was disappearing that way, which I did as best I could. When I asked him what he had been doing in Puerto Rico, it turned out that he had been staying with his mother who had inherited land from his grandmother and that he had gone down to Puerto Rico for six months to help her manage the farm. He was the only "man" on the place during the six months and his mother treated him like a man. As soon as this boy began to talk about what he did on the farm, he became animated and intelligent. He had a horse of his own to ride; he had some cows to tend and he explained to me very carefully how he had seen two of them through their calving. He also was in charge of the pigs. In the course of the conversation, he made it plain that every weekend he left the farm and went to town. His mother was aware of what he did in town and it was his right, apparently as a man aged twelve, to engage in these activities. She never expected him home before Monday.

This twelve year old boy was under the care of a stewardess on the plane who made a certain attempt to take care of him which enraged him. He regarded the stewardess as a sex object and tried to flirt with her. She was approximately twenty-five and was condescendingly amused and this enraged him even more. The final indignity came when we landed. The airline would not permit him to leave the airport although he insisted he could get home by himself. They telephoned for some "adult" in the family to come for him. He told me his brothers would have a good laugh on him over that.

Waller has a superb discussion of the ever-present sexuality in the classroom, but he discusses it as latent, disguised, unconscious--as it largely is in middle class elementary schools. The overtsexuality of pupils who, from their point of view are too young for adult sex may be quite threatening to middle class teachers. *

At Longfellow School the atmosphere is masculine. This is exceptional in a U. S. public elementary school When he was recruiting teachers for Longfellow, Mr. Tucker made a strenuous effort to get men and succeeded in making his staff about one-quarter male. All but one of the Assistant Principals are men; the woman is Negro. At Jefferson, too, the Principals and Assistant Principals are men, but there is only one male teacher in the elementary grades. It is not until the junior high school level that the staff becomes fairly masculine. However, it is not simply numbers which create the masculine atmosphere at Longfellow School. As one of the male teachers remarked, "In this school, the women on the staff defer to the men." Just what the "masculine atmosphere" means is a bit difficult for me to specify. There is a good deal of research which shows that woman elementary school teachers are partial to girls as opposed to boys. The reasons seem to be that girls are more docile and that, at that age level, girls sometimes develop more rapidly so that they are also better pupils academically. It is fairly clear that at Longfellow, the male teachers put up with a certain amount of "bad boy" behavior that female teachers would be more likely not to allow. I have seen a sixth grade male teacher for instance, allow a fight between two boys to go on just long enough for each of them to get in one good sock at the other and then break it up with no comment. I have also seen male teachers resist the attempts of boys to provoke them. On one day when I was watching a sixth grade class, the male teacher pointed out to me a boy who had come in that day and was in a bad mood. He was "spoiling for a fight". But said the teacher, "I'm not going to give it to him". He ignored this pupil all day and although the boy was sullen and not participating, he didn't engage in overt-aggression. Since the teacher did not insist on his conforming that day, a fight was avoided. There was another boy in the same class who didn't want to participate in anything; the only thing he wanted to do at the beginning of the semester was wash blackboards. The teachers let him do it and their comment to me about him by the time I was observing the class was "The less you ask of him, the more he wants to do."

---

* Bel Kaufman has nailed this down pretty well in Up the Down Staircase as she has so many things. One isn't even sure the author suspects her heroine of unconsciously provocative behavior.

The principal's intent in getting this large number of male teachers into the school was to provide some kind of adult masculine image for the large number of boys who come from female-headed households. However, the men are as attractive as teachers to girls as they are to boys and probably, from a psychological point of view, every bit as beneficial. None of the men on the staff of this school is Negro although several of the women are. *

School-Community Relations

I want to include a brief discussion of this topic which we have so far covered very unequally at the several schools. I have already mentioned that parents and teachers at Jefferson and Adams like and respect each other. However both of these, like all schools in the city, give the impression of being CLOSED. The doors are theoretically locked after the morning session begins. and a visitor must ring a bell to be allowed in. He will be conducted straight to the principal's office and asked to state his business. This is a citywide rule. ** At Adams it is followed. At Jefferson I soon learned which door was usually left unlocked and didn't have to go through the routine each time I was tardy. At Longfellow the door is always unlocked and the school has a good many visitors. Mr. Tucker is public relations conscious. He wants visitors, especially important ones. But there are many parents in the school each day, too; to patrol the lunchroom, for Wednesday morning coffee, for other meetings and for conferences with the principal and the teachers.

---

* Teaching is an even more predominantly female profession among Negroes than among whites. cf. Coleman, et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity, E-38001, Section 4.0.

**Again, the rule has a reason. In some of the city's neighborhoods there is a danger that drunks and derelicts will enter schools left open making corridors dangerous for pupils. At Lowell not only is this less likely, but there are so many visitors and school personnel walking around at all times that such a person would not go long undetected. At Lowell if you wander, someone, often a pupil, is likely to approach and offer to assist you. When I walked into a school in the next door working class suburb one day, I was recognized as a stranger at once, brought to the head teacher to whom I introduced myself and informed that strangers were not allowed into the school with out a note from the superintendent.

Jefferson and Adams see very little of their pupils' parents, especially the Chinese parents. The teachers at Adams told us that hardly a parent showed up on the days set aside for parent-teacher individual conferences. From reading the interviews with Chinese mothers we found the reasons they gave for not coming were 1) they didn't speak English, or not sufficiently good English; 2) it wasn't necessary since the child was doing well; 3) it was not possible since the mother had a job. We might add that Chinese-American women seem very shy with strangers. The idea of a conference with the teacher may awe them. "Everything we do is right according to them," said an Adams teacher, "even when we're wrong." This relationship with the Chinese community, if not ideal, has been comfortable for the school. It makes one wonder however what the teachers mean when they say "We know these people; we know these families." They see brothers and sisters succeed each other at school but they seldom see their parents. Nor do they usually see the children in other contexts. The truth is they know little about the Chinese community the school has been serving for years.

They even, some of them, know little about the children. One day in rapid advanced sixth the children were reading a story in which a Chinese girl explained to an American girl that all American-born Chinese children have a Chinese name but that many also acquire "American" names when they register in school. Since some of the children in this class were going by Chinese and some by American names, I asked them whether they would tell their names in the other language. We readily got from several their American "playground" names (bestowed by other children), but those who went by American names in class, though they admitted to having Chinese names, didn't want to say what they were. The teacher was amazed to discover that these children, whom she had been teaching for nearly two years were ashamed of their Chinese names. Someone had obviously chosen this story for the class to serve as a starting point for just this sort of discussion; but it couldn't have been Miss Ianello. She missed the cue.

Jefferson and Adams have no parent-teachers organization. Longfellow had a parents' "task-force" advising the principal through the summer before the school opened. They formed the core of the parent-teacher group which had its first meeting in the early fall and which the principal actively promoted. The Wednesday morning coffees were poorly attended; seldom were there more than 7 or 8 mothers and always the same ones. However, Mr. Tucker was not discouraged. He had mothers patrolling the project in the morning - on their initiative. He had mothers patrolling the lunchroom at noon - at his suggestion. The Wednesday morning group became the nucleus for "class mothers". Mr. Tucker has many more plans. One of them includes an experimental attempt to work closely with a group of mothers to raise their children's academic performance. Such agressive "reaching out" into the community is part of Mr. Tucker's philosophy for running a school. Activities like this are very congenial to him personally. He has an easy public personality. He likes to meet people and makes a favorable impression on most. (He is also popular with his teachers.) Such activities, on the other hand, are undreamed of by Mr. Plumley and would make him acutely uncomfortable. On every public occasion during the year he took with him his most outgoing assistant principal and usually let Mr. Colossi speak for him. He seems to have all the interpersonal difficulties of a very anxious man. His teachers express either a rather flat loyalty to him or a cautious dislike.

Lowell School has an active parent-teachers association. There is also individual parent-teacher conference every year, which parents seldom miss. In addition, there are all sorts of informal relationships with the school. The parents don't hesitate to make demands. They telephone, for instance, to ask that a child who cannot be met be sent home in a taxi. They complain to the principal of a teacher's excessive authoritarianism and demand that the child be transferred to another class--which he is. A physician asked the principal to stop the ducking for apples at Halloween because it was spreading a bacterial infection-- and it was stopped. (not without the teacher making a sarcastic remark about it in class to the physician's child, however.)

There is also cooperation of many kinds. Mr. Pannes took his class on a camping trip in early fall with several fathers along to help. Mrs. Purcell spoke to the parents directly to get "permission" for her class' local studies in comparative religion. ("We're having a very ecumenical year.") She also uses parents as a pool of expert lecturers. One had been in to give a talk on navigation. Since they are "scared of the kids", Mrs. Purcell said, they really prepared these talks with great care. They also had their children's prestige to worry about. Mr. Pannes (who called himself an "anti-Semitic Jew) had many complaints about the children's families and their values. Mrs. Dudley intimated that the parents made her life difficult.

The relative social status of parents and teachers is one of the determining factors in the nature of the relationship. The Chinese parents of Adams' pupils approach teachers with humility. Most parents of low social status avoid the schools. They are awed by or even afraid of the more articulate prestigeful teachers. Upper middle class parents are professionals whose occupational status is higher than the teachers' or else (in the case of married women teachers) the same.

At Jefferson and Adams the teachers' complaint is that parents don't come for conferences, especially the parents of the children who need help the most. At Lowell the teachers' plaint is that the parents put too much pressure on them to give special consideration to their darlings--while the teachers feel constrained to conform to their professional norm--all children are treated alike.

I had the impression that teachers strive with considerable success to conform to this norm in all four schools. In a way, close parent-teacher relations are a threat to it. Of course in any school pupils who remain for several years gain a reputation among the teachers (as a good or a bad student) which precedes them into every new class. *

---

* (Teachers similarly have their reputations among the students which are passed on from one generation to the next.)

Any bright child who has been in a school for a number of years can tell you that his reputation for brilliance may become so well established that he gets good marks he doesn't deserve. Youngsters I know have told me with scorn of getting "A's" on "lousy compositions" for this reason. A teacher who reacts to the composition rather than the reputation is likely to gain their respect. The situation is worse, of course, when a "bad student" is preceded by a personal briefing from his old teacher to his new. Sometimes pupils escape their reputations when changing schools. At Jefferson I came across two such transferred pupils. One of them was rated by her Jefferson teacher as "reliable, responsible, and cooperative". The unknown teacher in the previous school had called her "stubborn, impulsive and dishonest."

At Lowell the teachers sometimes intimate knowledge of family circumstances caused them to treat the pupils in terms of what they knew about the home situation. Mr. Pannes for example tried to diminish some of the "exaggerated fears" of a girl whose mother he considered "hysterically over-protective." At Lowell the teachers keep "anecdotal records" on the students, that is, they record their personal impressions of every student at the end of the year and these cumulative anecdotal records are available for the next teacher to read. Several teachers at Lowell were worried about their consequences. They said they never read the anecdotal records until the year was well under way and they could be sure of having formed their own, independent impressions of each pupil. Yet they did not feel certain they escaped the influence of other teachers' opinions. In the city at the pre-service orientation, teachers were sternly cautioned against putting their personal impressions into the pupils' permanent cumulative records, particularly unfavorable assessments, and on precisely this ground. "Those records will follow the student through life." The city keeps them permanently. Under special circumstances, they could conceivably become available to all sorts of agencies. *

---

* In her unpublished "Social Structure and College Recruitment" Natalie Rogoff Ramsy made the observation that one of the key differences between small and large high schools, especially if they also served small and large communities was the tendency of the small high school to be particularistic in its treatment of students while the large high school being impersonal, "knew" the student only by his performance. Students in small high schools were often preceded by the community reputation of their families. Students from good families are expected to be fine students; and students from bad families are expected to justify the family's reputation. Still another set of self-fulfilling prophecies. (Elmtown's Youth by August Hollingshead illustrates how this happens in the small high school.) The large high school, just because it judges students more nearly on performance alone, offers more opportunity for the bright student of low social origins to be upwardly mobile through the school.

Race Relations

Since most of the children at Longfellow are Negro, race relations and community relations are the same thing. Jefferson and Lowell however both have a minority of Negro pupils. Jefferson receives some Negro pupils from its own district and some, especially in the upper grades, under open enrollment. They come because they feel Jefferson is better than their neighborhood schools, yet they are not very welcome. The Chinese community does not welcome contact between the Negro children and their own. And while the staff varies from person to person, there are cues which made it clear that the Negro youngsters were not welcome to all of them. Here is a description of a scene in Plumley's office:

> . . . while I was waiting in the principal's office toward the end of the day I saw him deal with four or five Negro boys who must have been in the seventh and eighth grades. They were pretty big boys; they looked to be at least fifteen years old. The principal has a manner, which is about as different from Mr. Tucker's manner as one can imagine. With these boys he was correct; one might say, barely correct. He didn't smile, his tone was certainly not warm, neither was it rude or brusque; it was very cool. It seems that they had come to get special bus tickets which enable them to transfer from one bus to another on their way to and from school without paying more than one bus fare. The boys were crowding about him. He said, "I don't want you crowding near me. Come over one at a time," in a very businesslike tone. Then he asked each boy "What's your name? Where do you live? How do you get to school?"

> He asked them the necessary questions, and when they were entitled to them, he gave them the bus tickets. Of course Mr. Plumley is not notably warm and friendly with anyone so far as I can see.

On another occasion in the principal's office at Jefferson (the principal was not present) I witnessed a conversation among two teachers and the principal's secretary. One of the teachers reported that a girl in one of her classes had not brought back her report card signed. She said she had sent it home twice and each time it came back unsigned, and finally the girl told her that she had lost the report card, which had been signed, while returning to school. So the teacher went to telephone the home to say that another report card would be sent and would have to be returned with the parent's signature. She said that when she got the household on the telephone a man answered the phone and did not even bother to identify himself as the husband of the pupil's mother, but rather identified himself as her "boyfriend". They all giggled and one said, "She has a different one every week, but they usually call themselves her husband." It turned out that instead of listening to the teacher this man had launched into a long tirade of his own about how the mother of the girl works very hard both day and nights (more giggling and comments about the kind of night work she does) - and about how the girl's father lies in wait for her on her way to school and threatens her. Apparently the teacher was not at all sure that her message had gotten through to the mother. As the conversation continued, one of the teachers told me how she does not dare inquire when she hears that some one of her ex-pupils has had a baby or another baby; she does not dare inquire whether the girl is married or not. On the way out of the school the principal's secretary, to whom I was giving a ride, said to me, "You know, of course, that the mother of this child is a Negro woman. She is very attractive and quite articulate and in fact she seems to be well educated. You know, it is a strange thing coming out of a home like that. That woman has two daughters in this school, and believe it or not they are both excellent pupils and very well behaved. It just proves you can't generalize about things."

However, one generalization I will venture is that the pattern of sexual behavior of the mother and others like her arouses intense moral indignation among the lower middle class whites in the city including the teachers.

Lowell School has fewer than ten Negroes in its population of 800 pupils and all but one are bussed in from the city under a federally financed program. Lowell has absorbed this tiny group with no difficulty. (This particular suburb has had no difficulty with the program, unlike some other suburbs which have behaved as though two dozen Negro pupils from the city would destroy their school systems.) Here is an encounter between the principal and one of these children:

One of the little Negro girls, a child named Alia came into the office. Mrs. Dudley asked her if she had the note that she was to take home to her mother about the bus. Alia said, "No, Mrs. Dudley, you didn't give me any note".

"I sent the note to your room. Amy was supposed to bring it to your room and those notes were supposed to be handed out to all of you."

"Amy didn't come to my room, Mrs. Dudley. I didn't see her."

Mrs. Dudley said something like, "Oh, dear, Alia, why do I have to always have this trouble with you about notes?" Alia said, "It's because you don't like me" and Mrs. Dudley said, "Don't say that Alia, you're breaking my heart" whereupon out burst a giggle. Then Alia said, "Oh, man, I left that note in my room. I better go get it." Mrs. Dudley said, "Oh, man, you better." So she went upstairs and got the note and she came down and gave it to Mrs. Dudley. Then Alia said, "You're giving us too much work in this school."

"I know it and I know you're allergic to it but that's how we are. We give a lot of work. Now we have to hurry because I have to go to a conference."

"What do you do at the conference?"

"I talk and I listen but mostly I listen. Which do you do mostly?"

"I mostly listen."

"Well, you're pretty good in the talking department too." They both giggled. Alia had wandered over to a bookshelf filled with children's books and she asked Mrs. Dudley if she could have one of the books to take home. Mrs. Dudley said, "Sure, go ahead and sign out for it and take it home."

"Is it for me to keep?"

Long pause while Mrs. Dudley struggled with that. "No, I don't think so. You can keep it as long as you want to but when you're finished with it, you have to bring it back. Someone else might want to read it." Then Alia picked up something that looked like a book and had the Wizard of Oz on it and she said, "This has only got three pages in it, Mrs. Dudley". The principal said, "That's a record Alia, not a book and you can listen to that in the library."

"Can I listen to the whole thing or only part of it?"

"You can listen to the whole thing. Now let's go and take you to the bus".

"I don't want to go home."

"I know it but your mother and father are waiting

> for you and the bus is coming so we have to go."
>
> "I'm going to fall down in a dead faint." Whereupon, she proceeded to lie down on the carpeted floor. Mrs. Dudley looked at her. "Well, I guess I'm going to have to step over you and you'll be lying there and your mother and father will be waiting for you." Alia got up and Mrs. Dudley said, "Next week, the bus isn't going to come until 4:00 p.m." Alia said, "That's good," and walked out. Mrs. Dudley explained to me that the children don't want to go home at 2:00 when the bus comes for them so they've arranged for the bus now to come at 4:00 instead of 2:00 and this will make it possible for the Negro children to spend part of the afternoon in the library or on the playground.

There was one boy from the bussing program in Miss Hall's Grade 1. He took a bit of teasing at the beginning of the year but he gave as good as he got. At lunch he strove manfully to clean his plate, which left him no time for horsing around. The boys whispered scornfully that "He thinks he has to finish everything on his plate" (which he obviously did think) but by mid-semester Louis had become "acculturated" to the rich boys' pattern of wasting food. He left half his lunch uneaten and fooled around with the boys.

The Classifying Function of the Schools

"Streaming" in elementary schools is a practice of long standing. A number of studies in Europe and the U. S. have shown that teachers favor it. They are convinced that both the more and less able students benefit from being in classes with others of like ability. However, an overview of research on the subject does not confirm this view. The U. S. research has been so fragmented - studies have taken place under such a wide variety of non-comparable conditions - that results have been contradictory. They have added up to no solid addition to our knowledge of whether "homogeneous ability grouping" is beneficial, harmful or neither. One of the best *designed* studies of ability grouping was carried out in Sweden. * Its results showed little difference over the long run between students who were in homogeneous ability groups and those who were not, except that youngsters of low socio-economic status benefitted from being in classes with high SES students, while at the same time the high SES classmates lost nothing because of their presence. An analagous result has been obtained in several independent studies in the U. S. The Coleman report, also classifying students by SES, shows that low SES students profit from being in schools where they are mixed with high SES students, while the latter seem to lose *little from this mixing.* **

---

* Nils Eric Svensson, *Ability Grouping and Scholastic Achievement*, Stockholm, Almquist and Wiksell, 1962.

**However, the Coleman report does not show that the high SES children lose *nothing*. An earlier, unpublished study by Natalie Kogoff Ramsy, *Social Structure and College Recruitment*, showed that in 500 high school senior classes, chosen randomly across the U. S., performance of seniors of every SES (including the highest) was correlated positively with the proportion of high SES youngsters in the senior class. This implies that the "advantaged" youngsters did less well in senior classes of less "favorable" social composition. The measurement in this study is cruder than Coleman's measurement method which tells us that the performance of low SES pupils is more sensitive to the characteristics of the school, like its pupils' social composition, than the performance of high SES pupils.

There are several things none of the studies tell us. One is how upper middle class parents *perceive* the educational losses or the potential losses to their children of social class mixture in school. Probably they exaggerate them. However, from a political point of view it is necessary to recognize that even a small loss of educational advantage to their own children would be strenuously resisted by upper middle class parents, (no matter how much some other group might gain) because it implies a threat of downward mobility.

Having singled out social composition of the student body as a key variable affecting academic performance, researchers must now go on to investigate in a more refined way the academic consequences of various ratios of social class mixture. It is also necessary to study by what processes the social composition of their peers affects pupil performance, and to investigate how wide is the cultural gap across which the "social compositional effect" can jump. To design methodologically sound studies of these problems is no simple matter. Among other things it requires the whole-hearted cooperation of urban and suburban shool systems which often resist cooperation with research, especially basic research. School administrators tend to want some quickly usable results in return for their cooperation.

One of the better established research findings concerning streaming is that, it is to a large extent, a "self-fulfilling prophecy". Youngsters placed in the top streams get better teaching, a richer curriculum and the prestige of being an acknowledged elite; they are exposed to a high level of expectations from "significant others." All this, we know, is conducive to raising performance. Conversely, pupils placed in special classes are not exposed to the normal curriculum. They receive what could be described as an impoverished curriculum, one which moves very slowly and focusses almost exclusively on the acquisition of a few fundamental language and mathematical skills. There is no opportunity for a child in special class to catch up with the curricular progress of his age cohorts. The training given in special classes is appropriate for the mentally retarded. The difficulty is that a very large proportion of youngsters in special classes are not mentally retarded. They have normal and some of them better-than-normal ability. But for a variety of reasons, they have become educationally retarded. That is, they are behind the level of educational achievement for their age--which is the norm in the urban school system they have entered. When youngsters who are educationally, but not mentally retarded are placed in special class, this is almost a guarantee that the educational retardation will be perpetuated or aggravated.

The inner city school system studied here, and many others like it, has little provision for the needs of normally able but educationally retarded children. This is now the chief problem of northern city schools. They are receiving the products of woefully inadequate segregated education in the rural south and are faced with the task of bringing them up to the rising educational standards of the industrial metropolis. Attempts to meet the problem include various forms of "compensatory education" and planned racial desegregation.* Compensatory education in this northern city was briefly described above.

---

* These attempts are seldom accompanied by adequate evaluation studies, so that it is difficult to know how effective they are, academically and otherwise. cf. The Urban Review, May, 1968, Vol. 2, No. 6 for a debate of the evaluation of New York City's MES program which, over the short run, was shown to be academically ineffective.

I mentioned too the city's program of non-graded instruction (involving 2000 pupils) financed also mainly by Title I funds. Probably a large proportion of the city's youngsters who are educationally retarded are benefitting from one or the other of these compensatory efforts. How effective they are is not known.* As for desegregation, the Coleman report suggests that Negro pupils in desegregated schools benefit from this situation and that the benefit derives essentially from the social class desegregation which automatically accompanies it. That is, this "effect" is really no different from the effect of social class composition shown elsewhere in the report.

Of the three elementary schools studied here Lowell streamed students only at the top. There are regular classes and there are rapid advanced 5th and 6th grade classes. Jefferson and Adams streamed a minority of students at both the top and the bottom. In their district, too, there are rapid advanced 5th and 6th grade classes (which happen to be located in Jefferson) and there are also "special classes" for pupils who score between 60 and 80 ability tests - presumably the "educable retarded". At Longfellow, the predominantly Negro school, there is streaming only at the bottom: there are no rapid advanced classes** but there are "special classes".

---

*In the meanwhile, those educationally retarded youngsters outside of Title I neighborhoods (and this includes both Jefferson and Longfellow schools) rather than getting compensatory education are getting almost its opposite. "Special class" de-enriches their curriculum and accelerates their retardation.

**In 7th and 8th grades, classes are somewhat ranked, though this is done very informally and is not made public. The higher-ranked classes get a little more academic work.

A "Special" Limbo

I observed two special classes, one in Jefferson and one in Longfellow, for sufficient time to have learned a good deal about them. Both had teachers with training in "special ed"; in both cases they were experts in teaching children so retarded as to be classfied as retarded but "educable" or "trainable". Both teachers (there were actually more than two since the class at Longfellow had a string of teachers before the year was out) told me, however, that the educable retarded made up only a minority of their pupils. Mr. Bennet at Jefferson had sixteen boys aged around thirteen, fourteen and fifteen. One was Chinese, two were continental whites, two were Puerto Rican and the rest were Negro. Of these, he said, three were educable retardeds, two were trainable and the other eleven were of normal or above-normal intelligence. Mrs. Silver at Longfellow School said something similar. She had twenty pupils (the legal limit is eighteen but the school was short of special teachers) and of these she said the majority were not retarded at all but were simply "a bunch of juvenile delinquents".

What exactly was the status of the non-retarded children and how had they come to be in "special"? Mr. Bennet described several cases to me. Julio Vasquez had come recently from Puerto Rico. Mr. Bennet knew little about his schooling there - he was about 15 - but he did know that no English was spoken in Julio's home and Julio himself spoke very little English. Yet he was given English-language ability and achievement tests and of course scored very low. So he was put into "special". Julio's father had been to school to complain about the unfairness of the testing--Mr. Bennet vehemently agreed with him--but to no avail. Mr. Plumley pointed out that it would take a year or two to get a tester from "downtown" to come and test Julio individually. Mr. Bennet, a qualified tester himself, offered to do it, but this is not permitted in the system. Only personnel from "Downtown Tests and Measurements" are permitted to give individual tests. I was told that they usually take two years to fill a request for individual testing of a child. Meanwhile Julio, a boy who Mr. Bennet suspected was above average intelligence was bringing his own English-Spanish dictionary to school every day trying to teach himself English. The other Puerto Rican boy was a "discipline problem". Or so some teacher had thought; not Mr. Bennet. Glen sat most of the day with nothing to do--unless he happened to have brought a book with him. I noticed one day that he finished "morning arithmetic" long before anyone else in the class and had all his answers right. So I fished an ancient arithmetic book out of the closet and started him in the middle of it. The problems were word problems in English. I followed up with Glen for several days in this book and found that he was at grade level for his age in arithmetic--years ahead of the work the class was doing. It also appeared that he could read English quite well. It was apparently his reputation for bad behavior which kept him in special class. He had serious family problems, he was bundled back and forth from a mother who didn't want him to a father who wanted him less and he was nearly always in a blue funk.

Another boy in the class, a continental white boy* had recently been retested. After a year of promises that he would go into regular class if he tested out at the required level - he came out with a score of 79 (80 is the required score for regular class) and he was put back into special! This decision had sent him into a towering rage.** Several of the Negro boys in the class were recent migrants from segregated Negro schools in the South. They scored expectably behind the grade levels of an urban northern school.

The school seemed to know very little about the educational backgrounds of in-migrant Negro and Puerto Rican children. The Puerto Rican youngsters were caught in a special bind. In Puerto Rico English is taught as a second language from grade 4, but taught very ineffectively. The fact that the Puerto Rican youngsters can sometimes speak and read a little English gets them into the trap of being tested in English - which puts them at a serious disadvantage. Another important fact about the Puerto Rican school system of which the Jefferson School seemed unaware is that the compulsory attendance law is far from fully enforced there, especially in the rural areas. The legal school-entering age is 7. There is a shortage of places, however, and many rural children must wait until they are 8 or 9 to enter school. Those who enter late often drop out after two or three years. Therefore, a Puerto Rican boy of fourteen is certain to have had at least one year less of schooling than a continental boy the same age in this state, and he is quite likely to have attended school for only three, four or five years. The school system has collected no systematic data on the subject, nor does it take the actual number of school years the child has had into account in evaluating his test scores. In another case Mr. Bennet had asked Mr. Plumley to arrange retesting for a boy who had not been tested in five years, although according to the law youngsters in special class are supposed to be tested every two years. He got nowhere. Mr. Plumley took the position that even if some of the "special" pupils tested out as having normal ability, where would the school put them? There was no Spanish-speaking teacher in Jefferson's district; they were confined to the Title I districts. These special pupils are so many years behind grade level that they cannot be placed with their age group; it is impossible for them to keep up with the work in a regular class. To put them in a class at their own achievement level meant placing them with much younger children- a far too stigmatizing procedure for youngsters this age. The schools know from experience that they won't tolerate it. (That procedure is used with Chinese immigrants from Hong Kong and other immigrants who speak no English at all but who are otherwise at grade level, e. g., in arithmetic. They, too, are shamed by being with "the babies" but the situation is relieved by the understanding that they will move up to their own age group as soon as they learn enough English.)

---

* If the readers wonders why "whites" have suddenly become "continental whites", it has to do with my dilemma about placing them with respect to Puerto Ricans who so visibly range from white to mostly Negro with some Carib Indian mixture in all possible combinations and degrees. Puerto Ricans are also U. S. citizens; they are not immigrants.

**It enraged Mr. Bennet too. The tests are hardly so reliable that a score of 79--on one occasion--can be said to differ from a score of 80.

The special class at Jefferson did morning arithmetic but not once in the time I observed them did they do any reading. When I asked Mr. Bennet why, he explained that he had only some very old first and second grade readers which were at the right level in terms of vocabulary but which were so "babyish" that he couldn't get the boys to work with them. Besides, they already had worked with those readers, sometimes for several years. New supplies had been ordered the previous spring - including readers with simple vocabulary but more mature content, but they had not yet come. It was October 30. Mr. Bennet did a certain amount of work with vocabulary and spelling using materials he mimeographed himself. These were word lists, however, not reading texts. More than any other class in Jefferson school, the special class, or the majority of its members, spent the better part of the morning doing nothing. They just sat, literally, while Mr. Bennet devoted himself individually to the two or three mentally retarded boys whom he knew how to work with. It was his first year as a teacher and he evidently did not know what to do with the others. Not that it was an easy task, especially without materials. They all needed to be worked with individually since they were at widely different levels of achievement. Besides, they were terribly vulnerable. They did not like to recite before the group because to do poorly was acutely painful for them. The stigma of special class hurt badly. Even with each other, they were concerned to hide the depth of their respective deficiencies. Mr. Bennet was willing to work with them individually. But when he tried, for instance, to continue class after lunch the boys told him they were "always" allowed to play in the afternoon. It turned out that it was the school's custom to let special class play ball in the yard all afternoon every day, and the principal told Mr. Bennet to follow the custom.

Mr. Bennet was also discouraged by his failure to get his boys into shop classes. The shop teacher didn't want them. The principal supported the shop teacher. He told Mr. Bennet that he was paid "extra" for the burden of teaching these difficult youngsters and implied that sending them to shop was an attempt to "get out of teaching." The same thing happened to the teacher of the younger special class at Jefferson when she tried to get her girls into sewing class. She finally succeeded in getting them in, but the sewing teacher made life so miserable for them, that she took them out again and began teaching them to sew herself. Mr. Bennet reluctantly said to me (it was only his third month in the system and he was a product of it himself) "There are some people who don't seem to care."

Mr. Bennet also told me something which echoed what the ABCD administrator of the Longfellow School district had told me. Several of his boys were truant from school for days at a time or even weeks. "The truant officer knows where they are but he makes no attempt to return them to school."

This device for getting rid of pupils it doesn't want has probably been used by public schools since the first universal compulsory attendance laws were passed. De jure, the school must accommodate all clients defined as eligible, even the most unwilling. De facto, there are ways of pushing pupils out of schools--some don't need pushing--and with covert cooperation from attendance officers, they can be kept out. *

At Longfellow School Mrs. Silver, the special class teacher, spent most of the first day of school yelling for help and telling her neighboring teachers that the children were driving her wild. "This is not a special class, it's a bunch of juvenile delinquents." The second day she was absent. Thereafter she threatened daily to leave unless the principal provided her with proper conditions -- by which she meant a smaller class and one with no discipline problems. After a few weeks she did leave. Mrs. Silver was trained in the education of mentally retarded children. She had had long experience in the suburbs where, she told me, there were rarely more than 10 children in the special class; they were beautifully behaved and she was able to work with them individually. She said the work had always been deeply gratifying to her. At Longfellow she has 20 pupils. There were many more children in the school who by legal definition belonged in "special" but the principal had not been able to get the special educational teachers he needed to form additional classes. Among Mrs. Silver's special educational group of 9 to 11 year olds were three sullen adolescent girls, 15 or 16, who insisted they didn't belong in the class. Their test scores were extremely low. In addition to the stigma of special which all children in the school system feel acutely, these three were embarrassed to be with children younger than themselves and annoyed at being so far from the junior high school boys. On every occasion when they might be publicly seen with the class: on the playground, in the cafeteria, even walking through the halls, they made ingenious, and often successful attempts to get lost. In not too long a time Mrs. Silver and the class were engaged in a pitched battle. After she left the school, the children informed each new teacher who came to "cover" or "take over" the class that they would "get rid" of him shortly. They made good this threat several times until they got a teacher, a man not yet permanently licensed, who was determined to "hang on" because if he did, his license might come through. While his grammar, spelling and speech left a great deal

---

* An ex-elementary school teacher of New York City, whom I knew well, told me more than once a story which illustrates the process. When she first began to teach just after World War I, she had fourth grade class. On the first day of school as she was taking the roll call, a group of boys much older than the class walked into the back of the room, answered "Present" to their names, and left. She was too stupefied to try to stop them, but she reported the incident to the principal at the end of the day. "Mark them present and thank your stars they don't stay," he told her. "We need the state money but we don't need them." One might say "Plus ça change," but it is not quite the same thing. These non-present pupils were soon able to get work permits and jobs. Today's elementary school rejects have no such prospects.

to be desired, he did manage to contain the disorder within the classroom by walking around with a big stick which, he assured me, he never had to use. At the end of June he was still there. He and the class disliked and feared each other, but they had arranged a truce. In return for not bothering them with work, he got from them sufficient compliance with the rules to keep them from disturbing the rest of the school. I said earlier, this kind of truce - "Don't bother us and we won't bug you," sometimes describes whole slum schools. At Longfellow, the special class I observed had become a custodial institution. At Jefferson that did not quite happen because Mr. Bennet decided to "fight the system". But more of that in the next chapter.

The Elites

The rapid advanced fifth and sixth grade classes of Jefferson's district take a competitive examination leading to a distinguished academic junior-senior high school, which in turn may lead to an Ivy League college. Children are selected for these classes on the basis of test scores and teacher recommendations. Miss Ianello, who had the sixth grade class I observed, told me that test scores alone were not used because motivation was also very important and the teacher was the best judge of that. Often Chinese children from Adams who are selected for the class are not sent by their parents who prefer them to remain at Adams near their small brothers and sisters whom they look after. The sixth grade at Adams does some preparing for the test as well.

Miss Ianello's class had six Chinese children, 3 white children and 3 Negro children. She was another teacher in the school who spent a good part of the mornings I observed her out of the classroom. In her case, the reason seemed to be that she was a teachers' union official and had much business to discuss with another official in the school and many telephone calls to make.

When I observed the rapid advanced sixth at Jefferson it was only a month before the competitive examination. The class was engaged in repetitive drill on the types of questions which come up on the examination. Evidently this high school itself teaches in a very authoritative style, at least it does so to judge by its examinations. Here is an example of a day in the rapid advanced sixth at Jefferson:

> After lunch I went back to the classroom, and they had started working on parts of speech in a grammar book. They were learning the positive, comparative, and superlative, regular and irregular. Then they went on to do a little test which is apparently modeled

on the high school test, which is all on English, reading, grammar, and arithmetic. And in this test they had to take a paragraph and tell what the various parts of speech were. One of the things that is very noticeable (to me) is that the children are drilling on parts of speech in very great detail, and there stands the teacher, who knows all these parts of speech very well, constantly making the small grammatical errors which, it seems to me, about 90% of the city school teachers I have heard in the elementary school classroom make. She says, like every other city school teacher, "Everyone get out their pen." This is such common usage that perhaps by now it should be accepted as correct English. There are other errors she makes that are less acceptable. For instance, she told the children that the word "trouble" was a better synonym for "consternation" than the word "dismay". *

The final task of the day was to go through a poem The Rhodora by Emerson. The treatment is factual. You read the poem and question

---

* The Coleman report, op. cit. shows that nationally there is a non-random distribution of teachers, those with higher verbal competence going to schools with pupils of higher SES. The teachers in Jefferson and Adams have noticeably lower verbal competence than the teachers in Lowell. This is an illustration, then, of the national pattern.

(1) is "What is the rhetorical device that is used in stanza one?" The answer is "Personification"; (2) "In which line is it used?"... "In the last line"; (3) "Why is the last line an example of personification?"... "Because the flower is presented as growing in order to be interesting to the sky and to the brook." The teacher's comment about the line "If eyes were made for seeing, beauty is its own excuse for being" was to say to the children "Are eyes made for seeing?" "Yes."

There was some discussion of the Power that put the rhodera there which is the same one that put Mr. Emerson there. This Power was spelled with a capital letter. The children were asked what that Power meant. They gave a series of wrong answers. The teacher said "You are missing clues." The clue is that the word Power was capitalized; it was made into a proper noun and that is the clue to the fact that the Power is God. She pointed out they should look for clues.

The children were given some homework to do. They were given some problems they've done before, but the teacher said she wanted them to do them again.

The next morning:

The teacher was drilling the children on "the type of arithmetic problem you might see on the exam". She put on the blackboard "2/3=6;" "3/4 = 66"; and so on. I should have thought you would write it "2/3 x = 66; therefore, x = ? " But that is not how she wrote it. She left out "x". Then she said to the children "If you see a problem that looks like this, then what you do is you say, if 2/3 = 12, then 1/3 has to be half of that, doesn't it, so that has to be 6; therefore, the whole number, which would be 3/3, has to be 18." If they are going to do simple equations, I wonder why they don't use algebraic notation.

Today there was a poem by Lowell, Some Stanzas on Freedom. It was a call to New Englanders to rally behind the cause of abolition, but when a child asked Miss Ianello whether the poem had anything to do with the Civil War, she said it referred to no particular time or place. Of course it did have the general as well as the specific in it. The questions were like yesterday's. The poet asks whether anyone has such a "leathern heart" that he doesn't get excited when he hears of the wrongs done to slaves. What does "leathern heart" mean? To what does the poet

> compare "blood?" To "red larva". These poems are not selected to delight the children. They are selected to get them through the exam. At one point everyone got confused over a particularly involved figure of speech. (The Chinese children have a language problem anyway) and the teacher said "The trouble with poetry is that it's sometimes hard to figure out what the poet is saying."

But rapid advanced sixth must figure it out. Such are the burdens of the elite in Jefferson's district. Just as Jefferson's rapid advanced classes are perhaps the most authoritatively conducted in the school, Lowell's rapid advanced classes are its most autonomy-directed. The first thing to note about them, however, is that, except for one of the teachers who actually had a rapid class, the principal and teachers of Lowell School were opposed to these classes. When I asked Mrs. Dudley why she felt that way she said, "Homogeneous ability grouping feeds the tendency, especially of the brightest children to be 'cannibalistic' ". She claimed the rapid advanced classes were miserable. The children "ate each other alive" and by the time they were graduated, there was a thorough hatred of each against all. (I am using her language). She told me that she had asked the Superintendent of Schools for permission to experiment with a modification of the rapid advanced classes which would take the high test-scorers out of a regular class only for certain periods of the day to let them do special work in language and mathematics. She felt they should be in a heterogeneous group most of the time.

But why the word "cannibals" to describe the brilliant youngsters in Lowell's rapid advanced classes? I asked Mr. Shapiro; he agreed with the principal. He said the trouble came from home. The parents push their children as hard as they can. For instance, a child under psychiatric care is not supposed to be in a rapid advanced class, but Mr. Shapiro told me that several such children are in the classes and the fact is "concealed" from the school. In other cases where a child does not make the rapid advanced class, he is withdrawn to a private boarding school. This particular public school district has to compete with some of the best private boarding schools in the country. Many parents do not feel that the public school system gives a sufficient guarantee of entry of their children into a "good college" which means an Ivy League college. This is what Mr. Shapiro told me about a particular rapid advanced class:

He said that one year, the youngsters had become so verbally destructive that they had finally, after many attempts to do something about it, threatened to remove some of them from the class. According to his account the children are psychologically very sophisticated, which only improves their capacity to be destructive. He says that they know each others' weaknesses all too well and they know which buttons to push to make it hurt. He told me, for instance, about a wonderful girl he had who, he said, was carrying around an I. Q. of about 210, the brightest girl he had ever seen. He said she had a completely adult view of reality. She had a good idea of who she was and what she was like and lots of good ideas about the world and that she used to sit in the hallways and draw Degas' and Toulouse-Lautrec's. The other children ripped her apart all year. "About what? " I asked. "About everything. All her weaknesses, all her shortcomings, whatever they may have been". And he said that they had tremendous insight into what they were doing. They compared it to Lord of the Flies and talked about the good ones in the class and the bad ones and raised the question of why the good ones let the destructive ones do it to them. The good ones said, "What

> are we to do about it"? He said, "It's your problem." But he said their insight into what they were doing did not help them to stop doing it. He pointed out that usually if an adult tries to interfere in a children's society, he produces exactly the opposite result from the one he intends. That is, if he tells the kids to stop bothering some other child, they will bother that child all the more. He said, "You have to work around and under and through it. I tried to; I talked with them about it; we analyzed it and they analyzed it very well, but still they wouldn't stop. They really were absolute murderers tearing each other apart in a most vicious sort of way."

Mrs. Purcell used milder language but she told me that her greatest problem with her rapid advanced class (which she had had for both fifth and sixth years) had been to get them to work well with each other in small groups.

> She keeps circulating the captains and she gets everybody to work with everybody. She said that this wasn't always possible at first; that some of them didn't want to work with some captains, or others couldn't work with other people but that she had worked very hard on getting everybody in the class to be capable of working with everybody else. She told me a couple of little anecdotes in this connection. For instance, one child in the class

> had complained to her about the fact that the people in his group didn't want to do anything right. This child was very meticulous. He objected to the sloppy way the others wanted to to things. She had to explain to him that instead of just insisting that other people do things the way he wanted them done, which didn't succeed, he would have to find another method. So he thought about that for awhile and some time later, he reported to her that he had managed to get at least some of what he wanted out of the others by going along with them on some of their silly ideas. She also told me that when she first got these children they were extremely aggressive toward one another always pouncing on one another and pointing out each others' mistakes, saying "You're wrong and I'm right" and being rather nasty about it, and she said to me, "Wait and see how they behave today."
> What I saw that day was very polite behavior.

Nevertheless the problem has not disappeared. Academic competition is still a deadly serious matter for the students. If they have toned down their overt aggressiveness, they are still extremely vulnerable to pain at being surpassed in academic competition with others. This came out clearly on another day.

> Today Mrs. Purcell told me something a little different from what she told me the last time. She says she has been having a terrible time getting the children to work in groups; that is, not so much to work in groups, but evidently she has tried to group them for mathematics in terms of those who are better and those who are not as good because she says, they do vary widely in their mathematical skills. They resist this kind of grouping very much. They are already grouped; they are an elite group as a class, and they don't want to be grouped any more. However, she has managed this by going through some math and then saying at some point that those who want to leave the group and do something else may do so, and those who want to stay may stay. Some of them pick up what she is working on so quickly that they become bored with the repetition, and those who haven't picked it up stay. This is how she has handled this sensitivity of theirs about ability groups.

Other teachers in the third grade told me that the rapid advanced children became terrible snobs about their position and refused to associate with anyone not in a rapid advanced class. They regard themselves as an exclusive elite. The teachers were making a big effort to explain to them that in order to be a leader you have to know how to work well with people who may not be as bright as you are and that those other people can be valuable in ways that bright people may or may not be.

Mr. Pannes spoke to me at length about the things he doesn't like in the children of Lowell School. What he said particularly had to do with social problems and social studies. On one day he was very depressed because he had taken the children to see a film on the Eskimo at a nearby museum, and they had been totally bored by it. He said, "They're not interested in anything which does not concern them and their personal interests." He claimed that at their age in a public school in Detroit he was already active and interested in political and social causes but that he could not interest the children in those things. Also interesting is what the parents do and do not object to as topics for social studies. Mrs. Purcell has had no trouble getting the permission of the predominantly Jewish parents of her class to take the class on a tour of all the churches in the community, hearing talks by their pastors and studying their history and doctrines. Mr. Pannes has been able to discuss population problems and even contraception with only mild opposition. He had more trouble getting permission for the children to go downtown to political party headquarters because many parents feel that "downtown" even in daytime and even traveling in groups is dangerous for the children. When I asked whether the children had ever been taken on tour of a slum neighborhood, Mrs. Purcell said "We could never get permission for that. We're very protected here."

Actually, Mr. Pannes says, he would get into a lot of trouble with parents, they would object to a lot of things he does, except for the fact that each year his class makes the biggest gain on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. That is the payoff so far as the parents are concerned. He claims that so long as he keeps "producing the goods" this way he will be more or less left alone.

The parental pressure in pupils in Lowell extends down to grade one. Miss Hall told me that she starts the children right off on reading, partly because they are very verbal and very ready for it, but mainly because there is so much pressure at home for them to learn to read quickly and well. By letting them leap ahead in this area and reserving arithmetic for a bit later, she said, she feels she takes some of the home pressure off the children.

So it is clear that this is another socialization problem for Lowell. The pressure from the families to produce good academic results is enormous on both children and school. The school is making some effort to tone down the children's destructive and self-destructive competitiveness. This upper middle class suburban community, where a high proportion of parents are highly paid professionals, and Jewish is extremely aware of the classifying function of the schools and of school performance. They make their children aware of it from the first grade, perhaps earlier. They see their children in a race for the scarce positions at the top of the heap, and they push them hard. Both the homes and the school have a socialization style which emphasizes training for intellectual autonomy, which minimizes the distance between adults and children, minimizes parent and teacher authority. The homes, according to the teachers, subject the children at the same time to severe feelings of competition with their peers. The extent to which the school is able to tone down the competitiveness is limited because the parents are powerful. The school system is run the way they want it run. If the parents are afraid of the children, the schools are afraid of the parents.

What conclusions can I draw from this qualitative examination of four metropolitan elementary schools? Before listing them, I should like to reiterate that they are not presented as hypotheses which have been tested; they are hypotheses formulated on the basis of limited but intensive observation. They vary from a few empirical statements which may or may not hold widely true; to one or two more theoretically abstract hypotheses.

1. There are distinct elementary school cultures. Jefferson and Adams represent Willard Waller's old authoritative schools surviving still in the lower middle class sections of the city, but probably destined to disappear as their clientele departs for a lower middle class suburban existence. Lowell, in the affluent suburb is an autonomy-directed school unknown to Waller. Longfellow is not a clear-cut example of a slum school "truce", although its special class is an example of it.

2. There is enormous variation in the amount of instruction -- of both teaching and learning -- which goes on across the continuum of metropolitan schools. Where the slum school truce has taken over, there is almost no instruction; the school (or special classes) become mainly custodial. In the authoritative schools instruction was relatively slow-paced for several reasons:

a) There was a lack of resources. Teachers were used for fatiguing non-teaching activities.

b) There was a bureaucratic structure and leadership which forced teachers to play the role of bureaucratic employees and reduced the amount and variety of professional activity in which they engaged.

c) There was as yet no demand from this particular group of parents that their children be taught better and learn more. The schools were not under pressure from their own clientele to "improve".

In the affluent suburb teaching and learning have been stepped up to a pace much higher than anything known a generation ago. These children are learning more, acquiring more skills than their rather well-educated parents had at the same age.

3. The differing cultures of the schools result from the interaction of several inputs. Not all of them need be mentioned here since not all were treated of in this study. We know from existing research that the quality of the teachers and the social composition of the pupils are the two characteristics of schools which are most strongly related to academic achievement. Physical resources are less important than the quality of personnel.

Research has also shown the nonrandom distribution of personnel to schools. Elementary schools tend to be socially homogeneous because neighborhoods are. Teachers are distributed to schools in such a way as to match the more verbally competent, better trained, higher SES teachers with the schools that have higher SES pupils. The teacher recruitment processes which accomplish this matching have not been fully pinned down, but we know something about them.

This report has added only the suggestion that the same sorting and matching processes tend to produce a "fit" between the "authoritative" or "autonomy-directed" styles of school and home. Jefferson, Adams and Lowell showed such a fit. However, Longfellow, the slum school did not. Teachers' expectations as to how children have been trained before they come to school, as to the kinds of discipline to which they will respond - the expectations of both the authoritative and the autonomy-directed teachers - are violated by slum children, many of whom are "out of control" also by their parents. Teachers do not know how to cope with them and are often repelled by them. This is one of the elements of the "failure" which leads either to chaos or the slum school "truce".

The organization of the traditional authoritative school requires of these children a degree of impulse control they do not possess. The autonomy-directed style appears to be less alienating to them (they are also less likely to encounter it; Longfellow is exceptional in this respect) but it, too, has deficiencies where they are concerned. It assumes too much capacity on the part of the child to structure an open situation.

The other facet of the slum school "failure" which the report suggests is the absence in children of the slums of many pre-school cognitive "readiness" skills which the schools have been able to take for granted for so long that they are not aware there are children who don't possess them. The concept of "reading readiness" has been in the pedagogical repertoire for a long time. It needs to be deepened and broadened. In northern city, the tiny program of non-graded language arts in low-income neighborhoods has drawn up a list of over a hundred "skills" a child must possess to succeed in speaking, reading, writing and spelling. The elementary teachers (4 through 6) thought many of these were "innate"; but the primary teachers (K through 3) have learned that they are not "in our children. We have to teach them." The rest of the city has yet to come by this insight and rework the curriculum accordingly.

4. One of the standard streaming procedures of the city schools - the special class, if Jefferson and Longfellow are typical examples, is being abused. These are supposedly classes for mentally retarded

pupils but in fact they are dumping grounds for the educationally retarded in-migrants from inferior school systems and for "discipline problems". I might be disputed on this point. Some school officials would probably say that special classes are meant for the educationally retarded. If so, their object should be to work intensively with these children to bring them to a high enough level so that they can rejoin their age cohort in regular classes. The special classes have a legal size limit of 18, perhaps for that purpose. But they do not, except for teacher/pupil ratio, represent the extra investment of resources required for catching up. In fact, rather than working intensively, special classes do less academic work than any others. They are tacitly accepted as custodial classes where "hopeless cases" wait (or don't wait) for the legal school-leaving age.

5. The affluent suburban school has two socialization problems. The first, about which I know less than I would like, is the uneasiness about egalitarianism and its limits. How far can the school (and the family) go with equality of status between adults and children, teachers and pupils? Lowell has gone quite far and some of its most egalitarian teachers have found themselves at a boundary which their pupils, to their distress, overstep.

The other, more acute problem is that of destructive and self-destructive competitiveness which seems most severe among the brightest pupils. This problem does not exist in Jefferson, Adams or Longfellow--not even in the rapid advanced classes at Jefferson. Perhaps it is due to the traditional valuation of academic distinct on in Jewish communities and also to a fuller understanding by the upper middle class of the exchange value of academic success in contemporary society.

CHAPTER 2. INNOVATION AND RESISTANCE IN AN URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT: A CASE OF TITLE III, ESEA

Two of the schools observed in this study, Adams and Jefferson, serve a district in the neighborhood of a university Medical Center. The Center's medical school and hospitals urgently need space for expansion. Six years ago it became necessary to choose between staying in the inner city and moving to the suburbs. Despite the difficulty of acquiring sufficient land in the city to meet its needs, the Medical Center chose to stay. Its policy makers believed that the most serious challenges to the health professions now lie in the central cities; experiments with redistributing health services need to be made there. They wanted to remain at the fulcrum of change together with their students and clients. Their decision implied a concern with urban health in general, but also a special commitment to serve their immediate neighborhood.

When the century-old Adams School was scheduled for rebuilding, therefore, the Medical Center sought out the Department of Education of Northeastern City and volunteered to make planning a new Adams School an occasion for experiment in community health. A collaboration began in 1966. The city had two ESEA Title III grants, one for providing expanded health services to the elementary pupils of the district, and one for planning a new Adams School which would be architecturally and educationally innovative. Both grants were subcontracted to the Medical Center Planning Office under the title "The Adams School Planning Project".

As set forth in the grant proposal, the purposes of the project were:

(1) To provide school-based "comprehensive health care", including physical, dental and mental health, for all pupils of the future Adams School. More specifically, pediatric students and hospital residents would screen the pupils for health problems; the families would be referred, if they wished, to several possible treatment facilities; the Center would undertake to care for any pupils whose families chose it as their treatment facility; the Center would also take responsibility for intensive followups to insure that the children's families sought treatment for health problems uncovered by medical screening.

According to Dr. Green, Chairman of the Department of Pediatrics and Associate Director of the Adams Project, this plan would provide students of pediatrics an invaluable opportunity to work with children who had "normal growth problems". Thus, this part of the proposal served the interests of the medical school as well as those of the neighborhood. Dr. Green saw it as a first step toward the long range goal of providing total community health care. The idea was to reach the whole family through the school children.

(2) The Planning Office of the Medical Center was to design the school building as a "multi-use urban facility" to house apartments and community services as well as a school. The community services included recreational, informational and meeting facilities. The various portions of the building would eventually be sold or leased to private and public buyers. The school would also be designed: (a) to accommodate children with physical and emotional handicaps; (b) to accommodate an educational program based on "individualized instruction"; and (c) to accommodate the latest advances in educational technology.

(3) In the three years before the new school was actually built there would be transitional programs in the existing Adams and Jefferson Schools, pilot try-outs of the proposed innovations. These try-outs would help involve the local community in planning the school and would facilitate in-service training of the teaching staff in the innovative aspects of the educational program.

This summary of the proposals is rather modest by comparison with the language of the documents submitted to the government granting agency. For instance, the final report of the first year of planning discusses the educational goals of the new Adams School thus:

> ...the principal intent of the project is to develop the Adams school as a community resource. By providing as many alternatives as possible to students and community, the educational process may be 'individualized' to the extent that potential learners may have a greater decision-making role in their own education than is now possible. If the learning process can be tailored more towards an individual's requirements, then the learning environment can acquire a resource capability rather than being merely a fulfilled requirement.

Or to quote another document written at the end of the second year to describe the project for potential funding agencies:

The Adams School Project is a joint effort of the Northeastern City Department of Education and the Northeastern Medical Center to meet the needs of a rapidly changing urban community... through the design, construction and continuous planning of a community resource center, a center designed to evolve as the needs of the social system which it serves change... The major objective of the multi-dimensional complex is clearly an innovative design for community education in its broadest sense... the new Adams School, in the context of a major urban school system, would be able to provide truly individualized education, not only for its projected 800-1,000 school children in an equivalent K-5 grade range but for the various components of community of mixed ethnic and economic grouping as well......

The concept of a community school assumes an environment capable of responding to the needs of a diverse group in an urban setting. Identifying these needs is an obvious prerequisite to programming the environment as a community resource and is another aspect of planning for the new school....

A beginning has been made... but there are serious problems to be met in the lack of an adequate information dispersal system for the community at large, and the lack of a feedback mechanism to determine both present and future needs. The need for solutions to the problems of community involvement and the development of a community decision-making capability in terms of the planned environment must be met within the framework of the existing planning mechanism and will involve, as a first step, the hiring of community liaison organization staffs and the development of a program for community participation in the planning process.....

Committed to truly individualized instruction through a sub-school organization (including one to meet the needs of a variety of atypical children), non-grading, teaching teams, and a developing educational technology, and through the design of an environment which can provide evolving support to important education innovations, the new Adams School can become a laboratory where these innovations are tested and refined......

A second important factor... is the planned investment in educational technology. Although it is impossible to determine at this time the exact

> nature of the investment, it is safe to assume that commitment to any major provision for educational technology implies the necessity, not only for continued evolutionary planning for and evaluation of its use in the Adams School, but also the necessity for research and evaluation of its possible use and of its coordination with other aspects of the educational program. Thus, the new Adams School could conceivably become a major proving ground for the development of software for and use of computerized instruction. It could be a major resource for the study of the man-machine interface in all educational areas... In terms of the community too the prototypical evolutionary design involves continuing planning. The facility would provide a means both to study the changing community and its needs and the relationship between the subcultures in an urban community and their environment.

This ambitious vision contains nothing very innovative. Not even the "holistic approach to a community school" or a "community information resource" is a new idea in Northeastern City. "Information dispersal" means that some social services, including legal information and aid, a community library and a neighborhood information center would be incorporated into the "multi-use urban facility". The "feedback" mechanism means some combination of community organizations to represent the community's wishes to the "decision makers" (whoever they might turn out to be) and social research such as surveys and field studies of the character and needs of the neighborhood. The incorporation of a school into a multi-use urban building to be leased or sold to several private and public owners has been tried in New York City. School-based health services, while not widely institutionalized in the United States, exist in many places. Experiments with "individualized instruction" defined in dozens of different ways are widespread. So is experimentation with educational technology and a study of the physical environments required to accommodate it. "Community involvement in the schools", sponsored and unsponsored by government funds, is bursting out all over. That children with emotional handicaps should attend school with their relatively normal peers is the usual thing; the segregation of some diagnosed cases is not unusual either, and the debate as to which is the better situation for whom has been going on for a long time.

This is not to imply that for the schools involved the proposals do not represent radical change. Quite the opposite. Programs for radical change funded mainly by the federal government are so numerous in Northeastern City that a special Office of New School Programs has been established to minister to them. Two characteristics the programs share are (1) they lead a precarious existence since they are dependent upon unreliable federal appropriations; and (2) they have brought into collaboration with elementary and secondary schools, members of distinguished university faculties in and around the city; not just the Education faculties, but the medical , social science, and natural science faculties for whom collaboration with the lower schools is a new venture. University-school collaborations are another vogue concerning the success of which little is yet known. This chapter is intended as a frank report on the early stages of such a collaboration. *

The data for the chapter come from three sources. The author and an assistant spent a couple of hundred hours during the school year as teacher aide-observers inside the Adams and Jefferson Schools where the transitional programs, an intrinsic part of the "planning methodology" leading to the new Adams School, were in progress. Thus we had an excellent view of the impact of the Project on the principal, assistant principals, teachers and pupils. Another source of information was participation by the author in the weekly and monthly planning meetings of the Project staff and also in some of the many special meetings which occurred throughout the year. Thus I also had a view of how the Project was perceived by its staff. A third source of information is the official documents for the project.

The major gap in the data is a lack of day-to-day observations of the activities of the full time Project staff. For the first half of the year there was only one full-time staff member, an "environmental planner", trained as an architect, who was forced to be jack-of-all-trades. In the second half of the year the full-time staff expanded to four people and activity increased. During the second semester, the full-time staff became active in so many arenas-in fund raising efforts; in political

---

*Another such frank report, which is hardly encouraging, is Paul Lauter, "The Short Happy Life of the Adams-Morgan Community School Project", Harvard Educational Review, Spring, 1968, 38, 2, 235-263.

maneuvering with state and city agencies; in local community politics; in negotiations with architectural , real estate development, and educational technology consultants - that the prospects of the new Adams School seemed to change from day to day. Some days it had no money and was in hopeless political trouble. Other days it had lots of promising feelers and was politically in good shape; at least the right people had said nice things about it. The staff pressed forward on all fronts at once. By the end of the year it was still not certain that the school would be built, or rather, it was clear that there would be a new Adams School, but who would control it and to what degree it might bear some resemblance to the vision quoted above, was quite unclear.

The formal organizational structure of the Adams School Planning Project consisted of an Advisory Council which met monthly; a paid staff, largely part-time, which met weekly; and a small full-time staff. The Advisory Council included representatives from the Division of Elementary Education of the Northeastern Department of Education; from the city Office of New School Programs; from the Urban Renewal Authority, from the School Buildings Authority; from the staffs of Jefferson and Adams Schools; and all the members of the Project staff. A consultant from a nearby school of public health attended regularly. Other consultants and interested parties attended meetings when the agenda especially concerned them.

The paid staff consisted of the Director of the Project, an architect and city planner, who was also the head of the Medical Center Planning Office; and an Associate Director, Dr. Green, Chairman of the Department of Pediatrics at the medical school. In addition, there was John Dillon, the architect already mentioned, who was in charge of designing the building; a child psychiatrist-pediatrician who was in charge of the health care program; a child psychologist; a neuropsychologist; a nursing administrator and health education expert who was to serve as Health Coordinator; an elementary education specialist from the university's Department of Education, Mrs. Solomon; an administrative coordinator with M. A. degrees in Education and English; a social worker and several hospital administrators. Of these, only the architect in charge of the building design, the Health Coordinator and the Administrative Coordinator were full-time staff. The education specialist was half-time. All other staff members were devoting only small fractions of their time to the Project. For instance, the pediatrician-child psychiatrist in charge of health care, had no more than nine hours a week to give to the Project. Because of the delay in government funding, furthermore, he was not named as health care director until late autumn. The Health Coordinator and the Administrative Coordinator did not join the staff until January. A social scientist to carry on research and evaluation was provided for in the budget but no one could be found to take this post. Later in the spring two part-time "community relations specialists," one Chinese and one Negro, were added to the staff. Also added in the spring as a full-time staff member was a former urban renewal authority employee whose assignment was to find developers and potential buyers for the various pieces of the multi-use building.

The character of the neighborhood where Jefferson and Adams are located was described in Chapter 1. It includes the city's Chinatown. Adams is a K through 6 school which is almost 100% Chinese. Lately, in addition to second-and third-generation Chinese children, it has had a heavy influx of new immigrants from Hong Kong. Jefferson, a K through 8 school, is roughly 40% Chinese, 35% white, and 25% Negro. It receives many Negro youngsters under open enrollment from outside the district, but they are concentrated in grades 7 and 8. However, Jefferson is located on the edge of a neighborhood which is heavily Negro and Puerto Rican and it is receiving a small but increasing number of pupils from these ethnic groups into its primary grades.

The population of the neighborhood is changing rapidly. Neither the city nor the state has a very accurate picture of the migration patterns producing these changes, much less of their causes. From the standpoint of the schools, the most important change is the increased proportion of Negro children at Jefferson. The most important future change, however, arises from the fact that the new Adams School will provide grades K - 5 for the whole district, while another school will serve as a "middle school" (grades 4 - 8) for the whole district. This means that Adams - as a school with a homogeneously Chinese pupil population - will disappear. The new Adams School will be Chinese, Negro, Puerto Rican and white. While there is little doubt that many Chinese families value the ethnic homogeneity of the present Adams School, there has been no protest against the proposed change thus far. Members of the Chinese community are only slowly becoming aware of the implications of the proposed new building, and new catchment area for ethnic change in the school. Even those members of the community who understand the change and do not approve are reticent about organized protest. Many new residents of Chinatown are recent immigrants from Hong Kong; they have their citizenship to gain. They and their relatives cling to the pattern of remaining inconspicuous to avoid arousing hostility.

However, the tiny staff of Adams School itself and some of the older teachers at Jefferson do voice regret at the impending shift in the ethnic composition of their schools. As I pointed out in Chapter 1, Chinese children are viewed by these teachers as "ideal" pupils: docile, self-controlled, obedient, hard working and apt. The teachers in Jefferson have already experienced enough of a shift in pupil composition to know that the ethnic groups which the school will receive in the future play the role of the pupil differently, and they, as teachers, will be forced to change the way they play their roles. The old-time Adams and Jefferson teachers are thoroughly accustomed to the gratifications of being a teacher in a Chinese neighborhood and do not look forward to losing them.

This, then, is the setting for our account of innovation and resistance in the Adams-Jefferson School district during 1967-68. It was the second year of the Project's life. Several of the transitional programs proposed for the existing Adams and Jefferson Schools started or attempted to start during the course of the year. They included physical and dental examinations of pupils; a mental health program, and a new social studies - language arts curriculum. All these were limited, for the year, to grades K through 3. With the help of the university's graduate Sociology students, a survey was designed to study the health care practices and educational aspirations of Adams and Jefferson parents. The Project staff also discussed at length possible ways of involving the community in planning the new Adams School and the question of how to "program" the school educationally.

Although the transitional programs went on concurrently, the picture of what happened will be clearer if we trace each of them separately. Some of the important events to be described, however, relate to the Project as a whole.

The observers' first contact with the Adams Project occurred in the spring of 1967, when Mrs. Solomon, the education specialist, and John Dillon, the architect, discussed with them the need for collecting information about the community. These Adams staff members mentioned a forthcoming meeting at which they were going to present some of their plans to the Adams and Jefferson teachers for the first time. After the meeting was held, the observers (who had not yet arranged for this study) inquired about it. They were told the meeting had gone badly. First, the Department of Education sent no representative to it. The reason for the omission was not clear. It might have been due to the pressure of time and shortage of personnel. Nevertheless, the result was that the teachers were unclear that authority for the Project came from the Department of Education. Rather, they viewed the Medical Center personnel as the authors of the plans. Second, the presentation made by Mrs. Solomon met with unanticipated and "unbelievable" hostility. The teachers seemed to regard the Project as an intrusion into their schools. They felt the schools were among the best in the city, in need of no improvement. Some disapproved the site chosen for the new Adams School. Others believed the Medical Center was exploiting their pupils for its own ends. Many resented the fact that the teachers had not been consulted about plans which affected their future. One teacher objected explosively to the idea of including emotionally handicapped children in the new school. New and separate classes for emotionally disturbed pupils had just been established in Northeastern City's schools. According to the teachers this was a boon since such children are disruptive. "We have just gotten them out of the classrooms and they want to bring them back" was the complaint. This issue continued to be troublesome for some time. Due to lack of prior consultation with the teachers, the Project staff had been unaware that classes for emotionally disturbed children were newly established in the city after a struggle by the teacher's union to obtain them. For the teachers the proposal to bring emotionally disturbed children back into regular classrooms became a red flag symbolizing the Medical Center's disregard for their views and lack of information about what was going on inside the school system. For the planning staff, the teachers' reaction concerning emotionally handicapped children was shocking. "If I want my children to see freaks, I'll take them to the zoo", a teacher was quoted as saying. The quote became a touchstone in the Project for stereotyping the teachers as hopeless reactionaries.

The following autumn the author of this study and an assistant entered Jefferson and Adams School respectively in the role of teacher aides and observers. Although the study was independent of the Adams School Planning Project, they came from the same university. The principal and teachers at first confused them with the six student teachers who were placed in the two schools for the year by the university's Department of Education and who were connected with the Project.

On her very first day the observer in Adams, of an age to be easily taken for a student teacher, was received coolly. Here is her account:

> This morning when I went in, the first thing I did was to go up the stairs and report to the Principal. He seemed to recognize me and I told him that I had come in and would be coming in on Wednesdays and Thursdays and that it wasn't absolutely necessary that I be placed in grades one through three. He said, "Well, I've been thinking it over and actually we really don't need anyone else here, bu I think it would be better if you went over to the Adams School." Then he gave me directions on how to get there. He said that he would call the Acting Principal over there and tell him that I was coming, but that actually they had no real need for me in this particular school. This was all done very quickly. It seems that he had thought it out before. He also seemed very pleased with himself, that he had taken care of this situation so well. As I have previously mentioned, he is a very meek man, very quiet, and was very nervous the first time I had talked with him, but today he seemed not at all nervous and rather happy with the course of

events. He went in to call the Acting Principal at the other school, but he said that he wasn't in, and was apparently out in the school yard with the children.

I approached the Acting Principal [at Adams] and explained to him that we were interested in observing the children to see the effects of the health innovations on them and that in return for his right to participate in the classroom, we would be willing to help in any way that we could. This suggestion met with an instantaneous negative reaction. He told me that he didn't want anyone in his classroom and he didn't know how his teachers felt, but that he was sure that most of them wouldn't; that everyone seemed to take advantage of these underprivileged children; that you wouldn't find all of these observers going into suburban schools. The children shouldn't have to be put on display and neither should the teachers. He went on like this for about five minutes, speaking of the fact that no one seemed to consult the lower echelons; that all of the decisions were made up above and the lower people in the ranks had to put up with them. He realized that there was a lot of money available for the university's medical studies, but he said that some consideration should be made for the children. I explained that I wouldn't want to be in any classrooms for more than a few hours a week; that I could be in several classrooms. He did not seem to mind this quite as much but he explained that if I did stay there - and he said that it really wasn't up to him, since the decisions were often made for him unfortunately, - I might find resistance on the part of the teachers. First of all he said that he wouldn't want me in his classroom because as Acting Principal he had enough interruptions as it was and really couldn't put up with any more. The other teachers he felt might be resistant. He said that they feel that people are there to criticize them and they are very defensive. He told me an anecdote about a young student teacher - as a matter of fact, they had very few student teachers because the teachers did not want them. Well, last year they had had one who was a very nice young girl and whom everyone was very fond of and who was now teaching in Ohio, but she came back after her exams and was very much upset with the fact that during the oral examination they had asked her to give a brief critique of the teachers she had been working with. He was very amazed at this. He said, "Can you imagine an undergraduate who had been in a classroom for six weeks, giving a critique of a long experienced teacher? It just isn't right."

Everytime he spoke of the medical school and the innovations, he seemed to be very hostile to the whole idea. He believed that these children needed time just to be taught the elements, he said. "How can we be expected to bring them up to standard if we aren't given full time to teach them. We're constantly harassed by different people who want to come into the classrooms." He said that if this were a school in the suburbs and some observers wanted to come in and take up time, he was sure that the Jewish parents would immediately call and say that we wanted that person out of the classroom, we don't want our children on display, and this was the way he felt except that for the underprivileged children there was no one to take their cause and he wasn't going to permit them to be exploited in any way. He told me though that the teachers would be hostile as he had previously mentioned, but that if I just took my time about it, perhaps they wouldn't be too defensive regarding me.

About a week later, at coffee hour in the teachers lounge, the observer in Adams encountered for the first time the teacher most opposed to the Adams School Planning Project:

> They are very much in favor of the neighborhood school concept here. They feel that it is a shame what is happening to the neighborhood around the Adams School. It is being torn down; people are being displaced here. This particular teacher is not in favor of relocation of the school. She said, "They don't build schools like this. This school is much better than some of the most modern schools they build today." I personally can't see how she means this, but she was very emphatic. She's pro-the neighborhood school; she's totally against bussing. As a matter of fact, she just about took over the discussion in the coffee hour. Then she began talking to me. She said, "I hope you understand that there is a definite anti-medical center attitude here among us. It's not that we're against their personnel, we think you'd be very nice, and it's not anything personal, but we just don't approve of the way they're coming in here and ripping everything down and we don't approve of the program they're trying to set up. We have enough interruptions without having them take the children out of the classroom for health reasons,

> for health check-ups. The other interruptions
> many as they are, are necessary and I don't
> think that this is necessary!"

It is worth noting that this teacher was under a misapprehension that the decision to build the new Adams School was the work of the Medical Center. In fact, it was a city agency which had, some years previously, found the old Adams building structurally inadequate. But confusion on this point was not unusual. The teachers laid at the door of the Medical Center many changes in the neighborhood and in their own prospective situation which they didn't like. Sometimes they were right, or partly right, and sometimes they attributed to the Medical Center powers which it did not have--as in this instance. But right or wrong they used the Center as a target for their gripes.

This quotation from our observations also expresses some early resistance to the single most important component of the Adams School Planning Project, the comprehensive health care program. All participants in the Advisory Council regarded health care as the core of the Project and its strongest point. The high officials of the Education Department based their collaboration with the Medical Center largely on the value of the health care program. The Medical Center personnel concerned with the health care program had more specific and concrete ideas about what they wanted to do than any other part of the staff. The health care program was the best financed part of the Project. Yet the health care program as it was slowly initiated in 1967-68 met resistance at every step.

Originally a pilot tryout of the physical health program was to begin in 1967-68 in grades K through 3. Physical examinations of the children, ordinarily done by a school doctor who had several schools to cover and a part-time school nurse, were to be taken over by medical center personnel. Action was delayed, however, by the delay in federal funding. It was not until January that a health coordinator, needed to handle the liaison between the center and the schools, could be found and hired.

In the meanwhile a second meeting with the teachers of both schools and the co-directors of the Project was held in early October. Both of the Project Directors spoke at this meeting and answered questions. This time the Director of Elementary Education in the city Department of Education was present along with some other school officials. Perhaps as a result of their presence and of the almost exclusive emphasis on the health program at this meeting, teacher opposition was less open than it had been the previous spring. Still, some opposition emerged at the meeting. The teacher who had been most upset about emotionally handicapped children attacked this part of the proposal again, while Dr. Green tried to assure him that the plans were flexible. Nevertheless, the teacher left the meeting angry that no colleague had spoken in his support, although he knew many who agreed with his view. He vowed not to "stick his neck out" for the others again. One teacher spoke up against the site of the school. It was explained to her that given the urban renewal plans, the site chosen was the only parcel of land suitable for the building within the district. She remained unconvinced and said repeatedly that site's location near major points of transportation was dangerous for small children. A representative of a nurse's association wanted to know in what way the school nurse's position would be affected by the program. She received an assurance that there was no intention to displace the school nurse, only to supplement her work.

The author was present at this meeting, sitting with some Jefferson teachers. They left the meeting still reserved about the Adams School Planning Project, still feeling that they understood only very imperfectly what it was all about. On the other hand, the co-directors of the Project and the Superintendent of Elementary Education appeared to believe that the meeting had been a success.

At the beginning of the new year, the medical center was ready to start its physical and dental examinations, but then, to the surprise of Dr. Green,the school doctor objected strongly. He had already done the health screening for this school year. He had had to, since the Project was late in getting off the ground. He took umbrage at the implied reflection on his work. Once again, lack of knowledge of school procedures and lack of any day-to-day communication with the two schools had led the Project staff to give offense.

Miss Gray, the Health Coordinator, had in fact gone through the school health records and had reported that both the physicals and the records were very incomplete. The children's vision had not been tested this year because the necessary equipment had not arrived in time. (Incidents of this sort occur daily in Northeastern's schools. Supplies are always scarce and late.) Still the school doctor's anger was a serious problem. There were some hasty conferences with the Director of School Health for the city and the plan was revised. The Medical Center would conduct only dental screening for K through 3 this year. In the late spring it would give physical and dental examinations to the children who were registering to enter school the following fall. Dr. Green reported that cordial relationships with the Director of School Health had been re-established.

About two weeks later, at a weekly staff meeting, Miss Gray reported more trouble. She had been looking for a space in each school which could be used for the late spring physicals. Here it should be mentioned that annual examinations of the children had long been conducted in the schools, but not such elaborate physcial examinations as the Center planned. At Adams the Health Coordinator needed a room which would be sufficiently warm in winter. Not all rooms at Adams are well enough heated in winter for children who are undressed for a physical examination. There also had to be a screened-off space so that the children could have privacy, and room for the needed medical equipment. Mr. Plumley, the principal, contended that there was no such space in the building. However, Miss Gray had found a space which could be used for the purpose with some fixing. It needed some remodeling and repainting. She had volunteered both material and labor from the Center to do the job. But the principal said that no remodeling or repainting could take place in the schools except as it was proposed and approved through official channels and the work done by companies which had contracts with the school system. He pointed out that this would take time.

Mr. Plumley appeared to be using the bureaucratic rules to throw a roadblock in the way of the health program. However, other members of the Adams School Planning Project, for instance the neuropsychologist and psychiatrist, and the education specialist, were making demands for school space at the same time as the Health Coordinator. And they were also asking for important pieces of the teachers' time. These simultaneous demands on their limited resources of space, time and personnel were very disturbing to the routine of these two small schools. The principal was protecting these resources for the schools' prime objective--instruction. He was also protecting his position. The agreements which had been made between the Project and the upper echelons of the Department of Education were quite general. Their precise implications in terms of needs for space in the school buildings, time during school hours, and the help of school staff had not been thought out or discussed. The Project behaved as though the general agreements gave them carte blanche to whatever they wanted from the schools for Project purposes. The principal, on the other hand, appeared determined to do nothing which went beyond standard operating procedures without a specific order from his superiors inside the school system.

Problems of space and time for medical examinations were not resolved during the school year. Dental appointments were scheduled after school hours at the Medical Center. For the time being this was necessary since no dental chair had been installed in either school. The spring physicals for the Adams and Jefferson pupils were all done at Jefferson. Because they involved children who were entering school for the first time in the fall, the issue of encroachment on instructional time was avoided.

However, the problem reappeared at the end of the year when the city School Health Director, Dr. Barry, objected to the plan written into the proposal for the following year. The plan was to give physical examinations to all pupils in both schools. The customary procedure in the city is to give physicals at entry into school and to re-examine the children in grade 4. Dr. Barry wanted the Adams School Project to confine itself to this procedure. After a conference with Dr. Green and Miss Gray, Dr. Barry had his way. Dr. Green said that with the staff available, the limitation was realistic. The Medical Center was going to make one of its resident physicians available to the two schools for some part of every day. The physical examinations would be held on the school premises but after school hours. Presumably it would be easier for the working parents of the Chinese children to be present then. (The pattern of many of the Chinese families is for the mother to work during the day while the children are in school and for the fathers to work in the evening. Many fathers who sleep during the morning are able to keep appointments in the afternoon.) Aside from the fact that, legally, a parent is supposed to be present at these examinations, Dr. Green was eager to have them come. One of his aims was to use the physical examinations to collect family health information. During the spring when he himself conducted all the physcials, Mrs. Chen, the Project's Chinese community specialist, who had grown up in the neighborhood, was present to interpret the Chinese parents' questions to the doctor and vice versa. Dr. Green said he had learned a good deal about the health habits of neighborhood families. Mrs. Chen was able to explain to the parents why children had to undress for a physical examination (neither the regular school doctor nor many of the Chinese doctors required this), why blood and urine samples had to be taken, why first teeth had to be cared for even though they are eventually replaced, and so on.

At the conference between Drs. Barry and Green, the head of Nursing for the Department of Education at first objected to giving physicals after school hours since, she said, this would keep the school nurse at work overtime. The school nurse was vocally unhappy about the health program all year. She felt compelled to be present at the physicals, ostensibly because she was responsible for keeping the school health records. However, the physcial examinations by Dr. Green took much longer than those by the regular school doctor.(He was reported able to do 30 in an hour.) They encroached on the nurse's time for making home visits. She is expected to make a certain number of these each semester. Miss Gray, the Health Coordinator to the Project, a nurse with qualifications senior to those of the school nurse, was also present at the physicals and was also undertaking a number of followup home visits. As the year wore on these two nurses who began with a very friendly view of each other became increasingly antagonistic. Their job definitions overlapped. Each felt that the other was encroaching on her legitimate functions. Particularly this was true of the school nurse who felt that she was being displaced by Miss Gray.

This problem of "boundary maintenance" by the school will reappear at several points as we follow through the Adams Project's activities. Several occupational roles incorporated into the school system as staff functions are partly duplicated in the job definitions of Adams Project personnel. In every case the school occupant of the role has defended his exclusive right to the prerogatives which are part of both job definitions, and in the first stages of the struggle at least, has been supported by his colleagues in the school system. In every case, too, the overlap of functions was unanticipated by the Project staff because they knew nothing about the organizational structure of the school system and had worked out no routine of regular communication with anyone inside the schools who could have forewarned them.

The most serious problem relating to the health program of the Adams School Project arose in the spring. In March a relatively new staff member asked at a weekly meeting just how far the project was committed to giving free health *treatment* as well as *examinations.* Immediately he received contradictory answers. The Director of the Project said the Project was committed to free health care. Dr. Green was absent, but the hospital administrator in charge of dispensing funds answered in his behalf that the Project was *not* committed to giving free health care. The contract, she said, called for free health dental and mental health *examination,* but that was all. Treatment and care were not included. Children who chose to come to the Medical Center for their care would pay for it. If they could not pay, third party payment for which they were eligible would be sought--for instance, Medicaid. If necessary, they would be helped to establish their eligibility. Only in case there was no ability to pay and no eligibility for third party payment *as determined by the hospital social workers*, would care be given free of charge.

The non-medical members of the staff were stunned by this announcement. It implied the usual means tests, social work investigation, delay and red tape, which they had pictured as antithetical to their Project. They insisted that the contractual obligation was to give health care free of charge. The hospital administrators replied that such a commitment would put the Medical Center in serious financial straits and that the obligation was not in the contract.

The misunderstanding was all the more serious since most members of the Advisory Council, particularly the school system representatives, were known to believe that health *care* as well as health screening was being offered free of charge. The Project staff became preoccupied with breaking the news to the Advisory Council with the least damage to relationships. Eventually a document was written explaining that"ultimately" free care was offered, but only after all possible sources of third-party payment were exhausted. Just how much this explanation softened the blow was not clear. The issue is likely to rise again, possibly in a form very serious for the Project. By the time the Project staff members themselves were clear about the matter, the impression that free health care was being offered had spread to the Jefferson and Adams staffs and to some extent to the community. Thus far only few children and families had been contacted. Where care was needed there had not yet been a disagreement between the Center and the clients concerning ability to pay. Most of the children thus far screened were Chinese. Manywere reluctantto seek Medicaid since that involves applying through the welfare office, something Chinese families associate with disgrace. However, all of the Chinese families had savings. Once convinced that their children needed care, they were willing to draw on their funds to pay for it. As the program grews, however, there are bound to be instances where the Medical Center and family disagree about the family's ability to pay. Then the fact that the power to investigate and decide rests with the Medical Center will come to the fore, and there may be a feeling in some parts of the community that they have been misled, if not "betrayed".

Perhaps the most interesting question is how the false impression that free health care was offered took root at such a high level in the Project staff, whence it spread to other members and then to the schools and community. The highest level person who carries the false impression was the Project Director. He regarded the "Health Grant" as mainly the business of Dr. Green. Very likely he had not read the Health Grant contract through with the sophisticated eye for phraseology needed to detect its limitations. Both the Project Directors are very busy men for whom the Adams Project is only a tiny part of their total activity. Dr. Green, who knew the true situation, could often remain only a short time at staff meetings and devoted very little time to communicating with others on the Project. The top staff, in short, is heavily overburdened. There is not enough time for full and careful exchange of information among all persons who need to be informed. This situation, a very common one in teams of high level professionals who are in short supply and overworked, must not infrequently lead to foulups like this one.

Another side of the same problem is that the Adams Project relative to its ambitions has been inadequately financed from its beginning. It has never had the funds to pay for the proportion of the professionals' time it has actually needed. Hence the skimpy communication and the lack of careful groundwork which have led to all sorts of difficulties.

The second transitional program to be started in Adams and Jefferson during the year 1967-68 was the pilot "mental health" project. This too was late in beginning because of the delay in government funding. Another difficulty was the fact that Dr. Talon, the child psychiatrist appointed by Dr. Green to take charge of the program, was reluctant to move. He had very little time for theProject. Finally a neuropsychologist was added to the staff to work with him. Dr. Hammond was an expert in the field of learning disabilities such as dyslexia. It had never been intended that learning disabilities of this type should be the chief focus of the mental health program. That it became the chief focus was accidental. The learning diability specialist was the only psychologist at the Medical Center who had time for the Project and was willing to give it.

Dr. Talon and Dr. Hammond planned to meet with the teachers of Adams and Jefferson in order to train them to identify children with serious emotional problems or learning disabilities. The children thus identified would then be examined by the Project team and, if necessary, referred for treatment. Payment was to be on the same basis as payment for medical treatment.

The two doctors began by arranging to meet with the K through 3 teachers of Adams School for a morning hour once a week. To make the meetings possible it was necessary to free a classroom at Adams and also to find people to cover the teachers' classes while they attended the meeting. Mrs. Solomon, the education specialist, took responsibility for seeing that the classes were covered. She used mainly student teachers but occasionally she had to fill in with anyone who was available, for instance, Miss Gray.

The meetings were conducted by the neuropsychologist, Dr. Hammond. He asked the teachers to tell him and Dr. Talon what kinds of emotional, discipline or learning problems they had with their pupils. The Adams teachers replied that they had no discipline or emotional problems. So far as learning problems were concerned, there were two: the influx of youngsters from Hong Kong who knew no English and who had only one Chinese-speaking specialist teacher to give them some help in learning it; and (2) the fact that many children came to school without breakfast and became listless by 10:00 a.m. If there were emotional difficulties at all, they stemmed from the need to place non-English speaking older pupils in first grade classes until they gained some mastery of the language. The children "put back" this way felt ashamed. They wouldn't play the younger children's games and they hung back from all activities which they regarded as too childish for their age. There was a problem, too, in that in arithmetic the Hong Kong immigrants were ahead of grade level by U.S. standards. The teachers were eager to find a way of speeding up the process of learning English so that these children could be placed in their proper grade levels sooner. They wondered whether the doctors would help them with that problem.

They also wondered whether they couldn't have some help with the breakfast problem. The children seemed offended, they reported, at being told to "eat a good breakfast". They responded with shouts of "We eat lunch! We eat lunch!" or "We eat dinner! We eat dinner!" It was not clear whether the lack of breakfast had to do with poverty, with the morning time schedule of the many Chinese mothers who work, or with a different cultural patterning of meal-times among Chinese families. The teachers had arranged to buy doughnuts and milk at their own expense for some of the children to eat at mid-morning, but this was not enough.

The two groups of participants in the meeting seemed to talk at cross-purposes. The doctors asked about pupils with emotional problems and learning disabilities and were told that there were none. The teachers brought out what they felt were their real problems, but the doctors were in no position to help them with these. The language difficulties of immigrant pupils and nutritional needs were not mentioned in the Title III contract.

The teachers expressed considerable pride in their pupils. They told the doctors that they were the best behaved children in the city and highly motivated for school work. In Chinese fashion they tended to be emotionally reserved. The teachers also explained that the children worked incredibly hard. Many of them attended Chinese school after public school hours and helped out in the family business as well. It was clear that the teachers were fond of their Chinese pupils and respectful of the frugal, hard-working, integrated family life of the neighborhood.

After the meeting the doctors expressed disbelief in the absence of emotional and learning problems in this school. They felt the teachers did not yet trust them enough to "open up" concerning these matters. However as meetings in the ensuing weeks went about the same way, both doctors and teachers were increasingly frustrated. The teachers became irritated at pressure to reveal "non-existent problems". They told the observer they felt they were wasting their time. Dr. Hammond's unstructured way of conducting the meetings was unfamiliar to them. They began to conclude, as one said, that "The Medical Center doesn't know what it's doing!" They were annoyed, too, at the lack of response to their appeals for help on the "real" problems.

After three unfruitful meetings at Adams, the psychologists decided to move their activities to Jefferson for a while. Jefferson, it will be recalled, was ethnically mixed including white children of varying national descent, Negro children, both Northeastern-born and in-migrant from the South, and a few Puerto Rican youngsters.

The first meeting at Jefferson went quite differently from the one at Adams. Mrs. Johnson and some of the other teachers as well were eager for help with a child they believed to be dangerously disturbed. She was a fifth grade pupil who showed "inordinate interest" in younger children and on one occasion had followed a smaller girl home from school and beaten her up badly. The teachers were afraid that if nothing were done soon, worse might follow. They said the mother had refused to seek help for the child and Mr. Plumley was unable to do anything about the latest incident because it had occurred off school grounds, outside his jurisdiction. The psychologists promised to see about the matter at once.

The Jefferson teachers were enthusiastic about their first meeting. They took notes concerning the kinds of children the psychologists wanted them to single out and one remarked that it was a relief to know that something was at last going to be done for these pupils. Another meeting was scheduled for a week later. After the meeting Doctors Talon and Hammond went to see Mr. Plumley to offer help for the troublesome fifth grade pupil. Mr. Plumley responded that he would "make a note of it", but that any action would have to go through the school's "pupil adjustment counselor" whose function was to care for matters of this sort. The psychologists were astonished. They had understood that diagnosing emotionally disturbed pupils was their function under the guidelines of the Project.

At the start of the meeting the following week Mr. Plumley appeared to "make an important announcement." He scolded the teachers for talking out of turn the week before. "You can discuss things here as much as you like", he said, "but no action will be taken except through regular channels. Emotionally disturbed children must be referred to the pupil adjustment counselor." After he left, Mrs. Johnson spoke. "There's no use in our having these meetings. There's no point in discussing who's disturbed. If everything has to go through the same channels it's always had to go through, then obviously nothing is going to change. You can't be any help to us." Mrs. Johnson explained to the observer that the pupil adjustment counselor had several schools to cover; he had an enormous case lead; he showed up at Jefferson about once a month. The teachers had stopped referring their problem children to him because the delay between referral and action was so long that the situation usually changed completely in the interim. The over-burdened pupil adjustment counselor, the teachers believed, could not be effective.

Several more meetings were held at Jefferson but the teachers were disenchanted. They began to complain about losing "prime time" - the morning hours when they taught reading and arithmetic. Mr. Plumley told the education specialist, Mrs. Solomon, that there were too many meetings scheduled in the school by the Project. They were disturbing the routine. He finally cancelled all further meetings between the teachers and the psychologists.

The observer had a chance to see that the disturbance was real. One morning a second grade teacher told her pupils that she was going to go to another meeting tomorrow and they would have another nice teacher while she was gone. The children groaned. "We didn't like the one we had last time." Many of the classes had had a different replacement each time the teacher went to a meeting. At worst, the hour or two a week was lost for instruction; at best the children were upset by the constantly changing substitutes. The price seemed too high to pay for a series of conferences which appeared to have little value.

Doctor Hammond decided to administer some learning disability tests to children whose names had been referred to him by the teachers and, in addition, to a small random sample of K through 3 children at both Adams and Jefferson. However, he had some trouble finding an appropriate space for the testing. He discovered, too, that he would need the legal consent of each parent for these individual tests. The teachers doubted that the parents would consent to the tests and they were even more skeptical that parents would agree to anything so esoteric as the tutoring offered by the Learning Disability Clinic, especially if they had to pay for it. However, the real objection of the teachers to the learning disability program concerned its irrelevance to their "real" problems. There were many pupils at Jefferson who could not keep up with the work at their grade level for a variety of reasons. When a teacher found herself faced with a child who lagged very far behind, she could request individual testing by the city. Often there was a one-to-two-year wait before the Office of Testing could fill the request. If the child proved, on individual tests, to score an I. Q. between 60 and 80 he was put into a "special class" with a legal size limit of 18 pupils. Here he was supposed to receive individual attention from a teacher trained in the education of retarded children. However, "special classes" have a bad reputation in the city school system. According to some teacher-informants many youngsters, perhaps the majority in special classes, are not below normal in ability; rather they are "educationally retarded."* Placement in special class provides no chance to catch up educationally. Rather, any child left in "special" long enough becomes more educationally retarded, since he is exposed to a constricted curriculum.** Thus the teachers at Jefferson are faced with a dilemma. What was Mrs. Johnson to do with Julio Rosado who could not keep up with the work of his 37 grade 3 classmates but whose tested I. Q. was between 80 and 90. He was alively child, eager to learn if given engaging tasks, but a "discipline problem" whenever his teacher could not find time to lay out an individual program hour-by-hour for him. Julio, multiplied by tens, was the real problem of the Jefferson School. Multiplied by thousands he is one of the biggest problems of the city's schools. The centrally made, uniform curriculum does not "fit" him. Special class is a stigma and a road to increasingly dismal failure. The school system has no "right place" for him, no place appropriate to his needs. It was because some of them were acutely aware of this that the Jefferson teachers were discontent with the testing program of the Project. Though possibly of value to some children, it seemed largely beside the point.

However the Project psychologists proceeded with their plan. They took their jurisdictional difficulties to the District Superintendent. He repeated what the principal had said, and he noted further that he had very little power over how Mr. Plumley ran his school. At this point the entire Project drew the conclusion that their by-passing of the principal in planning school activites had been a major tactical error. They set about repairing it. They met with Mr. Plumley and apologized for having unknowingly disturbed the school routine. They worked out a procedure for clearing with him and getting his permission for all future activities scheduled at the school. Toward the end of the year the principal had agreed that next year perhaps, it would be possible to dispense with the processing of emotionally disturbed children through the pupil adjustment counselor. Cases of this sort in Jefferson and Adams could probably be referred to the Project psychologists directly for diagnosis.

---

* See Chapter 1.

** See Chapter 1.

Some kind of "community involvement" in the planning of the new Adams School is written into its objectives. Supposedly a transitional program of community involvement was to be undertaken in this second year. The subject was an especially ticklish one. During the first semester the Project sought a sociologist or anthropologist who would do research in the community and presumably fill the role of "informational feedback mechanism". No one could be found to take the job. This was problem since the Title III contract called for a baseline survey of the community which could be repeated several years later as a way of evaluating the impact of the Project. Finally some Sociology graduate students at the university volunteered to design and pretest a survey interview. The students spent the spring semester working on the study. They planned an interview with a stratified random sample of parents of Adams and Jefferson pupils, K through 6. The interview asked many questions about health and mental health practices and attitudes and also about educational aspirations and the parents' feelings concerning the two schools. The "payment" the students exacted for their work was inclusion in the interview of a good many data which were necessary if they were to write sociological masters' theses from the material.

Since the Project staff encountered the survey-interview while they were in the midst of the crisis concerning the Project health care commitment, they were fearful lest the survey arouse too much community interest and raise questions which, at that moment, they were unready to answer. The team of psychologists, having had their crisis with the prinicpal, felt that his permission should be asked before the survey was undertaken. Instead the District Superintendent's permission was asked and given. The survey-interview after being pre-tested, was printed in final form and sent to Mr. Plumley and to the Superintendent of Elementary Education together with an explanation of what would be done. There was no reaction until interviewing of the sample was just about to begin. Then the Superintendent said "Stop". She wanted all the interview questions to be eliminated, save those regarding health. No questions concerning education, the schools, or family characteristics might be included. The Project Director responded that the survey would in that case be dropped completely, since it was not worthwhile to go to so much expense for such a small yield of information. He added that this would mean one of the commitments in the Title III contract, which the Department had signed would be unfulfilled. The Superintendent turned the question over to her superior. He read the interview and, after eliminating four questions, okayed it. A condition was added that no parents should be interviewed who did not wish to be. Since this is a condition of all survey research it presented no special problem.

Although the study was designed and pretested by graduate students, the actual interviewing of the sample, coding and preliminary analysis were taken over by paid personnel. This is a far from ideal way to do survey research. Each time the study moved from the hands of one supervisor to another--from the designers of the study to the field supervisor who had to train and brief the interviewers; from the field supervisor to the coding supervisor; from the coding supervisor to the analyst, the design and purpose of the study had to be "transmitted". The failure to find a social scientist for the Project meant that there was no one person in charge of the study at the top, an absolute necessity for good research.

Nonetheless the interviews were carried through. This in itself was something of an achievement since bi-lingual, Cantonese-speaking interviewers had to be recruited. They had to translate the interview questions into the dialects spoken in the neighborhood, conduct many of the interviews in these dialects and translate the responses back into English. The quality of the interviews under these difficult circumstances was not bad; neither, however, was it excellent. The interviews were completed in the spring with few refusals. The main difficulty turned out to be that the family addresses, contributed by Adams and Jefferson schools, were very often incorrect. This fact--that the two schools do not know where their pupils live in many cases--is itself an interesting "finding". The mobility of this pupil population is undoubtedly high. In particular I suspect that many Chinese families who have moved out of the district have failed to inform the school because they wished their children to continue at the all-Chinese Adams School.

A different kind of effort at organizing "community participation" began in the winter when John Dillon, the environmental planner, invited several persons to a meeting to discuss the subject. The cast of characters at this meeting included Dillon, Mrs. Solomon, a psychiatrist who was a consultant to the Project, a city school principal with a reputation for skill and progressivism, a young school teacher whose connection with the Project I could not discern, and two professional community organizers, one of them Chinese but employed in a black community and the other a Negro, Mr. Bryant, who was working for ABCD in the district which bordered on Jefferson's.

The meeting was a strange one. Mr. Bryant, the psychiatrist, and the school teacher joined forces to castigate the Project's staff members for having worked for a year and a half without consulting "the community". They claimed that the Project had already compromised itself beyond redemption by its bad behavior. Dillon asked them what the Project should do to get community participation. They insisted that the community must have complete control over the planning, building, and running of the new Adams School. The community must design the building and the curriculum and hire the staff. Anything else was fakery. Their question to Dillon was, "What decisions are you really prepared to have the community make?" The question was acutely embarrassing since the Project had no power to determine its answer. The power lay with the Northeastern City Board of Education.

The Chinese organizer took a somewhat milder position. The school principal, who to his face was labeled "square" by the three radicals, seemed bewildered. Mrs. Solomon was also bewildered when in the middle of the meeting, Dillon announced that he had already hired Bryant to organize the community for the Project. The announcement was a surprise to everyone present. Later it turned out that the commitment was somehow cancelled. Throughout the year Dillon discussed Bryant in fluctuating terms. A few weeks after this meeting the tenants' organization and the housing development where Bryant worked repudiated him for "doing nothing". Dillon thought this was just as well. But in the spring Bryant who had meantime recouped politically in the housing development was hired to work for the Project, though he was put on the payroll of the Department of Education. The Education Department hired him on the basis of recommendations from several well known figures, including Negro leaders in the city. His mandate was to set up an association of community residents who were interested in improving community health. He was to work through the summer. What he actually did, I do not know. He never appeared at any Project meetings.

Another community liaison person, hired late in spring, was a Chinese woman, Mrs. Chen, who had grown up in the neighborhood but who now resided in the suburbs. Most of her work revolved around interpreting for Chinese families during the physcial examinations. She also helped to translate the survey interviews and to brief the Chinese interviewers. One informal opinion leader who spoke to us about her regarded her as a "traitor", because she had worked for the Urban Renewal Authority helping to relocate Chinese families who were being pushed out of their homes by renewal. It is a good indicator of actual community participation in the Project that no one on the Project staff or in the Medical Center has the slightest idea the currents of opinion within the Chinese community on any of these matters. Actually the Adams Project does not have a community as its setting. Chinatown is part of the school district. It is a genuine community and has been a highly organized one. It is new changing rapidly because new immigrants from Hong Kong are arriving in large numbers, and second-and third-generation residents are leaving for the suburbs.

A lower-middle class white neighborhood which is also part of the school district may or may not be a genuine community. The new housing development, which Bryant claims to represent, includes Chinese, Negro and white families. Tension between the rent-paying tenants of this middle-income development and some rent-subsidized, mainly Negro families who have moved in is growing. The rent-paying families of all three ethnic groups have a sharply different life style from that of the rent-subsidized families. Mrs. Chen believes that Bryant's tenants' association is almost entirely black in its membership. She says that the Chinese tenants, in any case, do not belong to it. While Bryant claimed in winter that inter-ethnic relations were good, Mrs. Chen claimed in late spring that they were steadily worsening. Both officially and unofficially, the Department of Education, the schools and the Project have ignored these problems of rising ethnic and class conflict which promise to be the central problems of the new Adams School.

A fourth transitional program of the Project for 1967-68 was the language arts-social studies experiment. Mrs. Solomon was in charge of this. She had planned to use a prepackaged curriculum about the "world of work" together with materials and simple equipment that came along with the books. However, the delay in funding for the educational planning part of the Project was much longer than for the health part. It was not refunded by the government until a year after the first planning grant had run out and there were no funds for these curriculum materials. The city Department of Education promised to help but did not. Eventually the books were obtained but the regular teachers, who were supposed to introduce this new program together with Mrs. Solomon's student teachers, refused to participate in it. They insisted that the student teachers and Mrs. Solomon do it alone. By the end of the first semester the "world of work" was declared a failure in these two schools by everyone involved in the effort, including Mrs. Solomon. She said the program was effective in the suburban school systems where she had had previous experience, but that the concepts used in the book were too abstract for the primary grade children at Jefferson and Adams. It was because they suspected this in advance that the regular teachers had declined to participate.

At the beginning of the second semester, Mrs. Solomon believed she had an agreement with the Superintendent of Elementary Education to write a social studies curriculum for the primary grade children in Adams in cooperation with the teachers there. The work began but after a short time the Superintendent called a halt. She told Mrs. Solomon that teachers could not engage in curriculum writing. There was a city-wide committee for social studies curricula and Mrs. Solomon would have to take her ideas to this committee and work through it. The detailed story behind this reversal of attitude by the Superintendent is not known to us. However, boundary maintenance seems again to be involved. The writing of curriculum guides is a function of the Department of Education. It is quite centralized in Northeastern City. In Chapter 1 I noted the problems that teachers face on this account. At Longfellow School they have found it necessary to "ditch the curriculum--it has nothing to do with our kids" except on the days when the Supervisor from downtown comes around. At Adams, too, teachers complain that the number of Hong Kong immigrants in their classes makes it necessary to spend far more time on language than the curriculum allows. Fortunately not all teachers stick to the curriculum. They adapt it, up to a point, to their pupils' needs, but they must often use uncomfortable evasions to do so, especially if they haven't the principal's support. (Mrs. Johnson bought the lizard and mice for nature study with her own funds and brought them to school despite Mr. Plumley's prohibition against "live creatures in the classrooms". Once they were there to the children's delight it was a fait accompli.)

At bottom the Superintendent's reversal on the social studies curriculum for this school district arose from a latent conflict between the Project staff and the Department of Education. The Project Director and John Dillon believed that the Project staff should "write the educational program" for the new Adams School. They believed that in designing the school architecturally with carrels for "individualized" work, and in planning for it to be equipped for computer-assisted instruction, they were "programming" the school. At least they believed that their building design and computer technology would force some sort of revolution in the school's organization and curriculum, a revolution which, they assumed, could only be an improvement.

Superficially there was agreement on those matters which, for the time being, required agreement. The Department of School Buildings had given the Project the right to design the school architecturally, together with responsibility for finding developers and buyers. The Department of Education was eager to have a building spatially suited to a non-graded program. The Elementary School Superintendent was an enthusiastic supporter of non-graded instruction. Together with a few of her subordinates, and using Title I funds, they had over the last three years introduced a non-graded language arts curriculum for the children of primary age into twenty city schools. They had accumulated considerable knowledge of the problems involved inchanging over a traditional graded school to a non-graded one: problems of space, of teacher morale and training, of finding equipment which is easy to use, and sturdy enough to stand the abuse that children give it and of finding a wide variety of published curriculum materials and creating materials themselves as the need arose. These few members of the Department of Education had done a lot of homework on "individualized instruction". They had traveled all over the country looking at non-graded schools. They had read the literature. They had done it themselves. Never for a moment had they yielded the position that the educational program of the new non-graded Adams School would be made by them.

The Project staff privately regarded the Department of Education as incapable of creating an innovative school. With one or two consultants they would hire, they were sure they could do it better. The Department of Education regarded the pretensions of the Project staff to educational expertise as ridiculous. Only Mrs. Solomon of all the staff members was a highly qualified expert in elementary education. Each side was somewhat aware of the other's attitude, although not of its intensity. The Department of Education suspected that something was afoot in the Project staff which constituted a threat to their control of the new Adams school. They were correct. The staff was trying to devise a strategy to pull the school out from the Department's control. The Project was somewhat less aware of the extreme hostility with which the Elementary Education Superintendent regarded their various statements orally and in print with respect to "programming" education and "individualizing" instruction. To the Department, the Project staff was simply unqualified to say anything on these subjects and should have kept quiet.

The real struggle for control of the new Adams School lies in the future. Just how difficult it will be and who will win I don't venture to guess. The struggle is not unique to this Project. All over the metropolitan area great and not-so-great universities, and also private corporations are trying to gain control over elementary and secondary public schools, and using federal funds, to make shining demonstration projects out of them. In every case - with more funds than the Department has had - they hope to show how much better a job they can do than the Department. The Department is on bad terms with the State Board of Education which has constitutional power to run the schools, though long custom to the contrary would make actual seizure of this power from the city school board difficult.

Thus the Northeastern City Department of Education is under attack from many quarters. It has been the subject of several sensational exposes. The intellectuals of the metropolis have declared it "hopeless". Its very existence as the agency with a monopoly of jurisdiction over public education in the city seems threatened. The fate of the Adams School Project is tied to the outcome of the larger conflict and neither will be known for several years.

It is at least possible that the pressures on the school bureaucracy together with the normal processes of staff replacement will produce enough change from within to save the Department of Education from its threatened dissolution. At the end of the school year, after an absence of many weeks, the observer returned to Jefferson School for a final week of intensive observation. The second floor where most of grades 3 and 4 and parts of grades 1, 2 and 6 are located had changed considerably. Grade 1 and grade 3 had been split and there were two new teachers, both young. Although the student-teachers from the university had gone by then, they, too, had represented an addition to the "young" contingent. The student teachers had been the Project's biggest success in Jefferson and Adams. In the past these two urban schools received their teachers mainly from the state teacher's colleges and some of the lower-status schools of education in the city. These student teachers brought in by Mrs. Solomon came from the Ivy League. Regarded with some suspicion at first, they were eventually liked by nearly everyone in both schools and generally given a favorable report.

The second floor now consisted entirely of young teachers (one of them a man) with the sole exception of Miss Kerin. The group had some social cohesion since they shared morning coffee in an empty classroom during recess. Only Miss Kerin never joined this group. She had been in the school more than 20 years, but she was now isolated on the second floor and reduced to having coffee alone since she did not want to intrude on the irreverent conversation of the young teachers.

The young teachers' coffee klatsch regaled the observer with news. Mr. Bennet the teacher of special class for the older boys had waged a great battle. For months he tried without success to get Mr. Plumley's help in demanding re-testing for some of his pupils who had not been tested in more than five years. (This is illegal). For others, non-English speaking, he wanted nonverbal tests. Mr. Plumley would not help. Bennet finally went over Plumley's head to the Supervisor of Special Education. At the same time he found a local activist group which tested his pupils outside the school and found them to have normal I. Q. 's . According to his colleagues, Mr. Bennet had put his job on the line, but he won. Some combination of pressures from above and outside changed Mr. Plumley's view. A tester came from downtown. Bennet was dissatisfied with her, though, because she announced that any Puerto Rican child in the country as long as a year who could not speak English was obviously retarded. Bennet told Plumley that if she was so prejudiced as she seemed, she could not administer a fair test to his pupils. She returned the next day with a different look. Her tests showed lower scores for some of the pupils than the community group tests had shown, but scores still within the normal range. Bennet was now engaged, with Plumley's help, in trying to find appropriate placements for his pupils for the summer and the coming fall. Some of them were going into a summer remedial language program. One was going to a vocational school. Several were almost surely going to go into regular class in the fall, but Mr. Bennet was agonized over this decision. He had no contact with their future regular class teachers. They must not fail again, he told the observer. "One more failure for these boys will be the end." The boys themselves looked very cheerful at their impending release from "special".

The special class teacher for the younger children, Mrs. Wilkins, was luckier. Two of her pupils were moving into regular class in the fall but they would stay in Jefferson. The teacher who was going to receive them knew their problems intimately and was willing to insure that they would succeed in their prestigeful new "regular class" status.

The young teachers on the second floor had done something more. They started a school library in the coffee klatsch room. There were classroom libraries in the school, but the books were not for taking home. The school library books were. Pupils helped to care for the tiny collection and catalogue. The library contained many books about Negro heroes, a tribute to Martin Luther King. Some of the older teachers in the school had refused to bring their classes to the school library. They claimed that the classroom libraries were enough and that some of the children would damage or destroy books they were allowed to take home. But that was the very problem the young teachers wanted to tackle.

Another item of news was a victory for the teachers' union. Next year there would be aides to supervise the children during their lunch period so that the teachers could eat lunch with each other and enjoy some respite from their classes. This increased opportunity to be together and talk with each other will perhaps create greater cohesion in the school, both of the young teachers' and of the old teachers' factions and possibly a stronger polarization of the two. The young teachers' faction was gaining strength through numbers. Three years ago Mrs. Johnson was the only young teacher in Jefferson School. Now the whole second floor had been taken over. "Faction" is perhaps too strong a word, but there was something in the air. At the time she first came to the school, Mrs. Johnson said, the corridors and classrooms were almost completely bare. There were no decorations, no displays. When she decorated her own classroom with a variety of displays she was indirectly criticized by the older teachers for "showing off". Now she had support. What the young teachers of Jefferson shared was not any radical set of views but simply a more contemporary pedagogical ideology and a less authoritarian style than typified the older teachers who had been graduated from their training twenty, thirty, and forty years ago. The Project, unknowingly, had contributed to the strength of the young teachers. Mrs. Solomon and the student-teachers she brought into the school represented the discovery-oriented, autonomy-centered style of the wealthy suburbs surrounding the city. The psychologists, too, represented a non-authoritarian approach to child development. Both of these groups were potential sources of support for the young teachers' professional views. If any alliance was to be formed, however, it looked as though the initiative would have to come from the teachers. The Project staff was unaware of the developments inside Jefferson School which had occurred during the year of "transitional innovation". In two years of planning they had established little contact either with the teachers of Adams and Jefferson or the communities the schools served.

The Project staff did most of its talking to VIP's and each other. More than half its energy had been consumed in writing applications and reports to the federal government agency funding it, and in conferring with other potential sources of fund--in short, in the effort to survive as a going concern.

A good deal of the remaining energy was invested in gaining approval for the "environmental plan" of the new school and for its location from the numerous city and state agencies among which power was fragmented. The Urban Renewal Authority had to approve the site. The Department of Public Buildings had to approve the environmental program. The State Board of Education had to agree to an 800 to 1000 pupil school at this site and commit itself to pay 65% of the construction costs on the theory (dubious) that when it opened the school would conform to the State racial imbalance law. * A developer had to be found who would

---

* The law requires that no community in the state have a school which is more than 50% nonwhite. It is proving unenforceable in Northeastern City due to rapid population changes. Within four years about half the public elementary pupil population will be nonwhite. In the meanwhile the law is slowing down the building of badly needed new schools. The Adams School district, for instance, is competing with a neighboring district for inclusion in its catchment area of a borderline middle-income housing development which has white children. Both districts need these children to "balance" their proposed new schools. Both fear that without their inclusion, the State will disapprove their plans for new schools. Another absurdity produced by the law is the Adams' districts attempts to have Chinese pupils classified as "white".

undertake to finance the building of the school and find buyers who would pay for various other parts of the multi-use building when it was completed. The Project also had to seek passage through the state legislature of a condominium law which would permit apartments and a school to be incorporated in the same building. The environmental plan of the school itself must be reviewed by the Department of Education (which however only has the power to recommend in this area. Public Buildings has control). And when all this is accomplished it will still be the prerogative of the Mayor to refuse the budget the city's share of the school construction costs. The Mayor has not been in on the planning and some of the planners seem unsure what he will do.

In view of these high-level problems and of its limited resources, it is not surprising that the Adams Project has done little work with the teaching staffs and the communities which will eventually people the new Adams School. Yet the doctrine of "local participation" which the federal government is promoting would demand that they do this, and so would common sense. As this chapter shows, the school staffs already feel like the objects of planning, rather than participants. Whether the community, when it is eventually called on, will respond the same way remains to be seen. During the summer of 1968--just to "keep things going"--Mrs. Johnson put together a summer recreation program for children from 3 years old up in the housing development which is the subject of competition between the two school districts. (She did this without knowledge of the competition.) The program is educational as well as recreational and has drawn on the services of a large number of community agencies and a great many sources of equipment and funds. Initially it met with hostility from the residents of the housing development. Nearly every night for the first two weeks it was broken into and burglarized; and every morning, the staff put the pieces back together. Then the vandalism stopped.*

The program provides breakfast, bus trips, walking tours, dramatics, arts and crafts, photography, a library---and an experimental educational program in inter-ethnic relations for urban children. It is housed in a large storefront. Its tables are made of empty garbage cans with boards on top of them and its partitions are made of fish barrels. Breakfast is served with federal surplus food. One hundred and fifty children attend daily, grouped by age. Anyone who comes is welcome. The doorsopen at 9:15 but the children begin gathering outside an hour earlier. The program has been pure improvisation and, so far as education and community participation are concerned, the best thing the

---

*This is reminiscent of the situation described in Chapter 1, Longfellow School is not vandalized whereas the school next door serving the same population is. Apparently public opinion, perhaps in these cases, the opinion of the children, has something to do with vandalism or its absence.

Project has done. It has uncovered an amazing number of "community needs". At the moment no one knows how it can be financed and held together in some form (possibly an after-school study center) during the coming year. Nor can the Project be sure that to hold it together is part of its mandate since it is now doubtful that the housing development will be in the new Adams School's catchment area. Furthermore, it includes almost exclusively development children--only one portion, at best, of the group the Adams School will serve.

Summary

The Adams School Planning Project has ESEA Title III funds to plan an educationally and architecturally innovative "community school" with special health services implicitly Northeastern Medical Center. The "environmental plan" of the school was largely completed during the first year so little has been said about it here, although John Dillon continued to refine and revise it during 1967-68. The school part of the building looks much like the other community schools now being designed in the city. It has small classrooms with movable walls grouped in a circle around a central resource area. Areas with individual carrels will perhaps be provided. The entire school is on one floor with all its administrative services on the floor below. There are two large gymnasia (one for use of the community), a swimming pool, a school library and a community library in the present design. The outdoor recreational area is on the roof above which rise two tall apartment houses which presumably will look directly down on the children at their outdoor play. The street level is intended to include the community social service spaces. Dillon and the Project Director believe that the physical design of the school necessarily implies non-grading and team teaching. It certainly makes these things possible.

The original health services plan has been watered down, at least for the transitional programs, by objections from the present Jefferson and Adams schools and from the city school health officers. Fewer pupils than planned will be given physical examinations and fewer kinds of examinations than planned will be taken over by the Center. A misunderstanding has developed concerning the obligation of the Medical Center to provide free health care to the children of the school district. Despite clarification, the Department of Education personnel on the Advisory Council still believe that health care will be given regardless of ability-to-pay. It is not certain they understand fully the implications of the fact that the Medical Center has reserved the right to search for third party payment and also to determine whether or not families have the ability-to-pay.

A great deal of the innovative thrust of the Project comes from the architectural ideas of its Director. He wants a "multi-use urban building" to house the school. This has involved the Project in responsibility for the building which in turn has meant it must deal with the multiple city and state agencies which have jurisdiction. The Project is caught up in the problems of divided power at the state and local levels.

Only a minimal start has been made in involving the community in the project. No adults in the community have taken any part in the planning of the school.

The educational program has been given little thought except for the decisions that the school will be non-graded and hopefully equipped with the latest educational technology, or at least designed to be capable of housing it at some future time. This situation is partly due to the fact that control over staffing and curriculum reside with the Department of Education which has so far indicated that it will follow routine procedure. That is, the staff will be recruited in usual Northeastern City fashion, most of it coming from the present Adams and Jefferson schools. And curriculum will be formulated by the curriculum specialists in the Department of Education. Curricular materials for non-graded schools have been developed to some extent by the Department which runs twenty schools that are non-graded in the language arts for pupils of primary age.

Nothing at all has been done to begin preparing the future staff for what is supposed to be a total change to their mode of operation. The Project still hopes that it can dispense with at least some of the staff of the old Adams School, especially the principal. The staffs of Jefferson and Adams, except for Mr. Plumley - who fully expects to be the principal of the New Adams - are only dimly aware of what is going on. The transitional programs of 1967-68 left them unimpressed.

A deficiency of the Adams School Planning Project is that no one has ever determined whether it is supposed to be an experiment in designing an innovative school or a demonstration of innovations which have already proved their value. The Project combines three functions, design, demonstration, and evaluation, which need to be separated.* They need to be separated because the conditions essential for each of the functions are destructive to the others. If the Project were truly designing an innovative school, it ought to be more heavily financed and freed from the political pressures which attend the planning of an ordinary school. As Brickell says,** design requires an "artificial and enriched environment." The Adams Project is planning a school which is enriched in terms of physical facilities for a city school, though not by suburban standards. On the other hand, the health services are not so very enriched, and the educational services may or may not be. Nor has the Project been freed from political exigencies. Thus the conditions are not favorable for innovative design.

---

* Henry M. Brickell, "State Organization for Educational Change: A Case Study and A Proposal" in Matthew B. Miles, ed. Innovation in Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1964, pp. 493-531.

** Ibid.

On the other hand if the Project were viewed as an instance of the demonstration of proven innovations, the conditions for planning the new Adams School ought to be as usual and ordinary as possible. They are not at all usual. The mere existence of the Project in relation to the school is artificial. Thus whatever the Adams School accomplishes, it will not demonstrate that the same things can be done by ordinary schools under usual conditions. Demonstrations which occur under artificial conditions are known to be uninfluential. Educators dismiss them as irrelevant because they know they cannot replicate them under ordinary conditions.

Self-evaluation is also presumably built into the Adams Project. But evaluation requires that an innovation already designed be implemented and observed and its outcomes measured under carefully controlled conditions. A Project engaged in inventing itself as it goes along cannot be properly evaluated. In fact evaluation inhibits invention as well as vice versa. It is predictable that the Adams Project will not carefully evaluate itself. Self-evaluation by the Project is not desirable even if it were possible.

The fact is that the members of the Project are not concerned to design an innovative school program, to mount an influential demonstration project, or to evaluate its outcomes. One of the Directors, Dr. Green, wanted to use the new school as a step toward "total community health services" to which he was committed. His plans met resistance from the school health authorities who apparently don't want a school with health services which outstrip by too far those of the other schools in the system. Dr. Green seems to have decided that it is wise to go along with them, since it became apparent in the course of the year that a very enriched program of free health examinations might stir up community demands for free health care, which the Medical Center cannot meet. In short, Dr. Green's original plans might boomerang, creating hostility toward the Medical Center.

The other director, a city planner and architect, is concerned about the need to attract and hold middle-class whites in the central city. Specifically, he hopes that urban renewal, providing attractive middle-income residences and a superior school will persuade some of the Medical Center professionals to live near their work. Another important aspect of the "multi-use building" is its potential for producing revenue. The dwindling tax base of the city makes it difficult to devote land solely to non-revenue-producing buildings like schools. If the multi-use building works, it may be a partial solution. In this sense the Project might have an important demonstration effect.

However the environmental plan of the school itself, while it makes such concepts as non-grading and team teaching practicable, does not make their practice inevitable. It is easy to envision the teachers and principal of Jefferson and Adams Schools moving into the new building and carrying on in the same, traditional way.* There must be intensive attention to staffing, staff orientation, school organization, and curriculum if the potentialities of the environmental plan are to be fulfilled. And before work on these matters can begin, the political problem will have to be solved. Who controls the educational program of the school--the Department of Education or the Project staff?

---

* See Chapter 1 for a description of the traditional style of these schools.